

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOV 1954

## CONTENTS

PERIODICAL  
READING ROOM

PAGE

SUDDABY, ELIZABETH—Three Notes on Old English Texts	465
HUTSON, ARTHUR E.—Troilus' Confession	468
ROBERTSON, D. W., JR.—Why the Devil Wears Green	470
SEVERS, J. BURKE—Did Chaucer Rearrange the Clerk's Envoy?	472
JONES, GEORGE FENWICK—William Dunbar's "Steidis"	479
BÜHLER, CURT F.—Diogenes and 'The Boke Named the Governour'	481
RINGLER, WILLIAM—Spenser and Thomas Watson	484
FURNISS, W. TODD—Jonson, Camden and the Black Prince's Plumes	487
CULLIFORD, S. G.—Hugh Holland in Turkey	489
SHARP, ROBERT L.—Donne's "Good-Morrow" and Cordiform Maps	493
SCHULTZ, HOWARD—"A Book Was Writ of Late . . ."	495
SIRLUCK, ERNEST—Eikon Basilike, Eikon Alethine, and Eikonoklastes	497
LEGOUIS, PIERRE—Three Notes on "Rochester's" Poems	502
ENGSTROM, ALFRED G.—Chateaubriand's 'Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem' and Poe's "The Assignment"	506
HOFFMANN, CHARLES G.—The Art of Reflection in James's 'The Sacred Fount'	507
WATKINS, FLOYD C.—The Structure of "A Rose for Emily"	508
PODGURSKI, J.—The Fate of 'La Chose Publique' in Modern French-English Dictionaries	510
REVIEWS:—See inside front cover.	

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

KEMP MALONE, General Editor

DON CAMERON ALLEN

WILLIAM H. McCLAIN

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

GEORGES POULET

ANNA HATCHER

BRUCE W. WARDROPPER

EARL R. WASSERMAN

S. K. HENINGER, JR., Secretary

The Subscription Price is \$6.00 in the U. S.; \$6.25 in Canada; and \$6.50 in other foreign countries. The price of single issues is \$1.00.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editor of *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the *MLA Style Sheet*.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

## CONTENTS—Continued

### REVIEWS:—

	PAGE
JOHNSTONE PARR, <i>Tamburlaine's Malady and Other Essays on Astrology in Elizabethan Drama</i> . [Carroll Camden] . . . . .	512
EDWARD HUBLEE, <i>The Sense of Shakespeare's Sonnets</i> . [G. Bullough] . . . . .	514
ARNOLD STEIN, <i>Answerable Style: Essays on Paradise Lost</i> . [Wayne Shumaker] . . . . .	516
JOHN M. BULLITT, <i>Jonathan Swift and the Anatomy of Satire. A Study of Satiric Technique</i> . [Robert C. Elliott] . . . . .	520
PERCY A. SCHOLES, <i>The Life and Activities of Sir John Hawkins: Musician, Magistrate and Friend of Johnson</i> . [Bertrand H. Bronson] . . . . .	521
ROBERT GALE NOYES, <i>The Thespian Mirror: Shakespeare in the Eighteenth-Century Novel</i> ; FREDERICK S. BOAS, <i>An Introduction to Eighteenth-Century Drama, 1700-1780</i> . [A. H. Scouten] . . . . .	524
ELIZABETH NITCHIE, <i>Mary Shelley, Author of "Frankenstein"</i> . [Kenneth Neill Cameron] . . . . .	526
MERLE M. BEVINGTON (ed.), <i>Matthew Arnold's "England and the Italian Question"</i> . [Hillis Miller] . . . . .	528
GEORGE ARMS, <i>The Fields Were Green: A New View of Bryant, Whittier, Holmes, Lowell, and Longfellow, with a Selection of Their Poems</i> . [Lawrence Thompson] . . . . .	530
CARLOS BAKER, <i>Hemingway, the Writer as Artist</i> . [John L. Stewart] . . . . .	532
R. S. CRANE (ed.), <i>Critics and Criticism</i> . [Robert B. Heilman] . . . . .	534
KENNETH G. T. WEBSTER (trans.), <i>Ulrich von Zatzikhoven: Lanzelet: A Romance of Lancelot</i> . [George Fenwick Jones] . . . . .	537

S

view  
ltt-  
and  
sted  
hna

AGE

512

514

516

518

521

524

526

528

529

530

531

537

8

view  
ulti-  
and  
ented  
Johns

PAGE

512

514

516

518

521

524

526

528

529

530

533

537



# Modern Language Notes

Volume LXIX

NOVEMBER, 1954

Number 7

## THREE NOTES ON OLD ENGLISH TEXTS

### I. *The Wanderer*, line 65 ff.

Wita sceal geþyldig,  
ne sceal no to hatheort ne to hrædwyrde,  
ne to wac wiga ne to wanhydig,  
ne to forht ne to fægen, ne to feohgifre  
ne næfre gielpes to georn, ær he geare cunne.

A wise man must be patient; he must not be too passionate, or too hasty of speech, or too feeble a fighter, or too rash, or too timid, or too glad, or too greedy for wealth, or too ready to boast before he sees his way clearly.

In this enumeration of all that a wise man ought to be, the phrase 'to fægen' seems at first sight out of place. The main point is obviously that extremes of all kinds are to be avoided, and most of those enumerated suggest a familiar background of battle, love of treasure, and the uttering of vows. The warning against excess of gladness is not so obviously relevant. It occurs again, however, in a late Old English homily, in a passage very similar to these lines from *The Wanderer*, and presumably based on a similar tradition of gnomic wisdom; and there the reason for its inclusion is perfectly clear. The passage is at the end of Wulfstan's *Sermo De Baptismate*:<sup>1</sup>

ne beon ge ofermode ne to weamode ne to niðfulle ne to flitgeorne ne to felawyrde ne ealles to hlagole ne eft to asolcene ne to unrote. ne beon ge to rance ne to gylpgeorne ne færinga to fægene ne eft to ormode.

Do not be arrogant or too ill-humoured or too envious or too quarrelsome, or too talkative, or altogether too much inclined to laugh and then afterwards too sluggish and dejected. Do not be too proud or too ready to boast, or too cheerful suddenly and then afterwards too despondent.

<sup>1</sup> Wulfstan, *Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit*, ed. A. Napier, Berlin 1883, No. v, p. 40.

Here, twice over, the warning is plainly given against the unstable temperament that drops too easily from hilarity into depression. And it is possible that line 68 of *The Wanderer* contains a blurred reflection of the same idea.

## II. *The Battle of Maldon*, lines 189-190.

he gehleop þone eoh þe ahte his hlaford,  
on þam gerædum þe hit riht ne wæs.

The syntax of 190b is uncertain, but the half-line is usually taken to be a relative clause. If this is so, either *þe hit* is the compound relative, and the phrase means 'which was not right'—a comment on Godric's conduct in general; or else *þe* alone is the relative, and *hit* is the impersonal subject of the verb, and the phrase needs to be expanded in translation—'on those trappings which it was not right (to mount on)'.<sup>2</sup> Such a use of the relative, however, seems awkward; and I suggest that it would be more satisfactory to adopt the emendation proposed, as a possibility, by Dr. C. T. Onions, in his note on this line in Sweet's *Anglo-Saxon Reader*,—" *þe hit*, 'which' (?) or perhaps emend *þe* to *þeh* 'though'."<sup>3</sup> The two lines could then be translated—'He leapt up onto the horse which his lord had owned, onto the trappings, although it was not right.'

It is true that the only time the word is used elsewhere in the poem (as an adverb, in line 289) it is spelt *þeah*; but *neh* for *neah*, in line 103, and *genehe* for *geneahhe* in line 269, would seem to indicate that *þeh* is a perfectly possible form for this poem. What chiefly supports the emendation is the concurrence of almost exactly the same half-line in two other Old English poems. It appears in the poem *Genesis A*,<sup>4</sup> in Eve's confession of how she yielded to the temptations of the serpent:

and þa reafode, swa hit riht ne wæs,  
beam on bearwe and þa blæda æt.

and then, *although it was not right*, despoiled the tree in the wood, and ate the fruit.

It appears also on folio 84a of the *Exeter Book*,<sup>5</sup> in a passage

<sup>2</sup> *The Battle of Maldon*, ed. E. V. Gordon. See also *An Anglo-Saxon Reader*, ed. A. J. Wyatt, p. 281; and *English and Norse Documents Relating to the Reign of Ethelred the Unready*, ed. M. Ashdown.

<sup>3</sup> *An Anglo-Saxon Reader*, ed. H. Sweet, 12th edition, 1950, p. 216.

<sup>4</sup> *The Junius Manuscript*, ed. G. P. Krapp, p. 30, line 901.

<sup>5</sup> *The Exeter Book*, ed. G. P. Krapp and E. V. K. Dobbie, p. 148, line 61 ff.

describing how the rebellious angels planned to seize the throne of God:

... þa hi to swice þohton  
 ond þrymcyning þeodenstoles  
 riene beryfan, swa hit ryht ne wæs.

... when they purposed treacherously to deprive the great king of glory of his royal throne, *although it was not right*.

The use of *swa* in the sense of *although* is not uncommon in Old English,<sup>6</sup> and this certainly seems to be the meaning here. If the emendation of *þe* to *þeh* is accepted, the half-line 'swa hit riht ne wæs' and line 190b of *The Battle of Maldon* would be identical in meaning, and in construction, the only difference being that in *The Battle of Maldon* the clause is introduced by the usual Old English word for the conjunction 'although,' and in the other two poems by its less frequent alternative.

Another parallel example, in which a very similar clause is, in fact, introduced by the conjunction *þeh*, *þeah*, occurs in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle annal for 1036:<sup>7</sup>

forðan hit hleoðrode þa swiðe toward Haraldes, þeh hit unriht wære.

for the general voice was very much in favour of Harold, although it was unjust.

In itself the emendation presents no difficulty, for since the following word begins with *h*, the assumed omission of the final letter of *þeh* would be a simple example of haplography. The occurrence of *þe* seven words earlier may also have had some influence on the miswriting of the word.

III. *The Alfredian version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History, Book IV, Chap. xxiv.* (H. Sweet, *An Anglo-Saxon Reader*, No. x, *Bede's Account of the Poet Caedmon*, line 74)

And he eall þa he in gehernesse geleornian mihte, mid hine gemyngade, and swa swa clæne neten eodorcende in þæt sweteste leoþ gehwyrfe.

And all those things which he could learn through listening, he turned over in his mind, like a clean beast chewing the cud, and converted into the sweetest poetry.

<sup>6</sup> See C. W. M. Grein and J. J. Köhler, *Sprachschatz der angelsächsischen Dichter*. Swa, 10.

<sup>7</sup> C(Abingdon) version. *Two of the Saxon Chronicles parallel*, ed. Earle and Plummer, Vol. I, p. 158.

This comparison of Caedmon with a clean beast chewing the cud (which is a literal translation of the Latin original) derives from Leviticus xi. 3, and the traditional allegorical interpretation of the text. A very clear statement in Old English literature of such an interpretation occurs in Aelfric's *Lives of the Saints*, No. xxv—*Passio Sanctorum Machabeorum*.<sup>8</sup> Aelfric has, in the course of his narrative, occasion to mention foods considered unclean by the Jews, and there follows a short digression on animals clean and unclean according to the Mosaic law, together with their allegorical significance, and including these lines:

þa clænan nytenu þe heora cudu ceowað  
getacniað þa men þe on heora mode smeagað  
embe godes willan syððan hi his word gehyrað  
of lareowa muðum swylce hi heora mete ceowan

The clean beasts that chew the cud betoken those men, who, just as if they were chewing their food, meditate in their hearts upon the will of God after they have heard his Word from the mouths of teachers.

The connection between these lines and the passage in the Ecclesiastical History may well be only an indirect one. But Caedmon, pondering the religious instruction given him by the scholars of Hild's monastery, before turning it into verse, is in fact an admirable illustration of the clean beast, as explained by Aelfric.

ELIZABETH SUDDABY

*University College of the South West, Exeter*

#### TROILUS' CONFESSION

In *Troilus and Criseyde*, II, lines 506-574, Pandarus told Criseyde how he had learned of Troilus' love for her. He and Troilus, said Pandarus, had been amusing themselves with a little physical exercise, until Troilus excused himself because of weariness:

Soon after that bigonne we to lepe,  
And casten with oure dartes to and fro,  
Tyl at the laste he seyde he wolde slepe,  
And on the gres adoun he leyde hym tho;  
And I afer gan rome to and fro,  
Til that I herde, as that I welk alone,  
How he began ful wofully to grone.

(II, 512-518)

<sup>8</sup> Ed. W. W. Skeat, *E. E. T. S.* 94, p. 68, line 38 ff.

Then, said Pandarus, he crept near Troilus, to hear what was amiss;  
and he heard Troilus begin his confession,

He seyde, 'Lord, have routhe upon my pyne,  
Al have I ben rebell in myn entente;  
Now, *mea culpa*, lord, I me repente.' (II, 523-525)

. . . my lowe confessioun  
Accepte in gree, and sende me swich penaunce  
As liketh the, . . . (II, 528-530)

Wyth that he smot his hed adown anon,  
And gan to motre, I noot what, trewely, . . . (II, 540-541)

The form of this account of what happened is interesting. It contains the *mea culpa*, noted by Root and Robinson as the well-known phrase from the *Confiteor*, which is recited by the penitent before Confession. This phrase Pandarus, who, though a Trojan, talked remarkably like a fourteenth-century Christian, recognized; and his later words, "'He gan to motre, I noot what, trewely,'" sound very much like a description of the murmur of the penitent in the confessional. Taken with the other phrases, they can be so interpreted; and surely Chaucer's audience can hardly have missed the allusion to an experience which they all shared.

The supposition that they recognized the contemporary form of this speech is turned into certainty when we consider what actually happened. Pandarus, of course, did not tell Criseyde the exact truth: that he had come unexpectedly upon Troilus at home and in bed, and had with much difficulty wrung from him the cause of his malady and the name of his sweet foe. Nor did he tell her that when he found that it was love which afflicted Troilus, he directed him to make a formal statement of sorrow for the sin of rejecting love—or, as we should call it now, an Act of Contrition:

Now bet thi brest, and sey to God of Love,  
'Thy grace, Lord, for now I me repente,  
If I mysspak, for now myself I love.'  
Thus sey with al thyn herte in good entente. (I, 932-935)

Troilus did as he was asked,

Quod Troilus, 'A, lord! I me consente,  
And preye to the my japes thow foryive,  
And I shal nevere more whyle I live.' (I, 936-938)

The Act of Contrition, of course, is said after Confession.

Troilus' reply to Pandarus includes the necessary elements for such an Act: Contrition (sorrow for sin); prayer for forgiveness; and a statement of determination not to repeat the sin. And the line, "Thus sey with al thyn herte in good entente," is a poetic paraphrase of words often used by the confessor, "Now make a good Act of Contrition."

Pandarus did not carry out the performance so far as to impose a formal penance upon Troilus, but he did speak rather severely to him ( I, 911-931 ), just as a confessor might speak to a penitent before imposing penance, summarizing his many single acts performed in committing the sin.

There was no reason for Pandarus' telling Criseyde his little fib, except that he seemed to enjoy dressing up the facts to make a nice little story. Literal truth was never, with Pandarus, a desideratum; but, like many creative artists, in adapting the literal truth for literary purposes, he showed clear traces of his source-material.

ARTHUR E. HUTSON

*University of California,  
Berkeley*

---

#### WHY THE DEVIL WEARS GREEN

The summoner of Chaucer's *Friar's Tale* rode out under a "grene-wode shawe" like a hunter "evere waityng on his pray." But there he met another hunter:

And happed that he saugh bifore hym ryde  
A gay yeman, under a forest syde.  
A bowe he bar, and arwes brighte and kene;  
He hadde upon a courtepy of grene,  
An hat upon his heed with frenges blake.<sup>1</sup>

That the green hunter confesses himself to be "a feend" does not disturb the impenitent summoner, who has sworn to be his "brother." To his credit, the gentleman from "fer in the north contree" was a man of "softe speche" with whom "daliance" seemed pleasant. But the devil's green garment has been taken as

<sup>1</sup> *Canterbury Tales*, III (D) 1379-1383, text of F. N. Robinson, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Cambridge, Mass., 1933), p. 108.



a kind of unheeded warning, since it is said to suggest the Celtic underworld. Thus R. M. Garrett, writing of *Sir Gawain*, observed, "The color green connects the Knight with the Celtic underworld. Chaucer's Friar's Summoner should have taken warning at the color of the devil's clothes, but pride closed his eyes."<sup>2</sup> But even after the summoner learns the yeoman's identity he shows no sign of taking warning. The friar probably wished his exemplary summoner to look as much as possible like a true "brother" of the devil. Chaucer and his Friar may or may not have been familiar with the verdure of the Celtic underworld. But there was a clear and well known non-Celtic authority for dressing the devil in green clothes, and as they appear here, these clothes are if anything the opposite of a warning.

One of the most distinguished humanists of the mid-fourteenth century was Pierre Bersuire. He translated Livy, composed a moralization of the Bible, a Scriptural dictionary, a commentary on Ovid, and a moralization of the natural world which generally follows the organization of Bartholomew de Glanville's *De proprietatibus rerum*. Personally, he was a friend of Petrarch and of the poet whom Petrarch called, somewhat extravagantly, "the only poet among the French," Philippe de Vitry.<sup>3</sup> One chapter of his great encyclopedia is devoted to the color green. As we should expect, this color has meanings both "in bono" and "in malo."<sup>4</sup> But in the course of his discussion Bersuire points out that green is a pleasant color so that beasts like it and are attracted to green places. Hunters who seek beasts in such places dress in green so as not to forewarn their victims and so as to appear pleasant themselves. This fact suggests the techniques of that old hunter, the devil:

<sup>2</sup> "Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight," *JEGP*, xxiv (1925), 129. Cf. J. R. R. Tolkien and E. V. Gordon, *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (Oxford, 1930), p. 86: "... gren was a fairy colour, and suitable for such a being as this knight, whose Green Chapel was nothing else than a fairy mound."

<sup>3</sup> For Bersuire see F. Ghisalberti, "L'Ovidius moralizatus di Pierre Bersuire," *Studi romanzi*, xxiii (1933), esp. pp. 15-25; J. Engels, *Etudes sur L'Ovide moralisé* (Groningen, 1945), 23 ff.

<sup>4</sup> For the principle, see Augustine, *De doctrina Christiana*, II, 16 (24). In his Scriptural dictionary Bersuire usually arranges the "good" and "bad" meanings of the signs he explains separately.

Venator ergo diabolus, scilicet hypocrita, solet vestes virides, id est, honestam conversationem induere, ut praetextu exterioris honestatis, possit bestias, id est, simplices ad se attrahere, & dum insidias malitiarum suarum non praecavent, ipsos decipere & fraudere. Ideò bene dicitur Matt. 7. *Attendite vobis à falsis Prophetis, qui veniunt ad vos in vestimentis ovium, intrinsecus autem sunt lupi rapaces.*<sup>5</sup>

The Friar's devil clearly fits this description. He is a hunter dressed in green seeking his prey "under a forest syde." His cheery welcome, his very polite "deere brother," and his courteous and frank replies to the summoner's inquiries give him a sufficiently "green" air, just the kind of protective coloration needed to attract his fellow worker the summoner.<sup>6</sup> I suggest that it may well have been Bersuire's account or one like it rather than memories of Celtic myth which dressed Chaucer's devil in a green coat.

D. W. ROBERTSON, JR.

Princeton University

#### DID CHAUCER REARRANGE THE CLERK'S ENVOY?

The late Professors John M. Manly and Carleton Brown differed fundamentally as to whether the manuscripts of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* reveal successive stages in the poet's arrangement of the tales. Professor Brown affirmed that this was so; Professor Manly denied that Chaucer ever fixed upon even a single order for the tales, let alone successive ones—all existing orders being purely scribal. It is all the more striking, therefore, that they were in agreement as to the evidence for authorial revision at the end of

<sup>5</sup> *Opera* (Coloniae Agrippinae, 1730, 1731), II, 543.

<sup>6</sup> It should be pointed out that the Green Knight is not quite comparable to the green devil. In the first place, he is not a hunter. On the evil reputation of hunters in the Middle Ages, see Rudolph Willard, "Chaucer's Text that Hunters 'ben nat Hooly Men,'" *University of Texas Studies in English*, XXVI (1947), 209-251, and Muriel Bowden, *A Commentary on the General Prologue to the Canterbury Tales* (New York, 1949), pp. 109-110, 116-117. Cf. Bersuire, II, 424, in a discussion of deserts: "ibi tamen sunt aucupes, & venatores, id est, daemones." Again, the Green Knight not only wears green; he is green. That is, there is no discrepancy between himself and his clothing. We might more readily compare the Friar's devil with the Yeoman of the General Prologue, but current opinion views him favorably. Thus Miss Bowden, p. 88, calls him "a sound and likable fellow."

the *Clerk's Tale*: they agreed that when Chaucer first wrote the *Clerk's Tale* he did not have in mind that it was to be followed by the *Merchant's Tale* (the present order in the *textus receptus*), and that subsequently, when he put the two tales together, he altered the ending of the *Clerk's Tale* to achieve smoother transition to the *Merchant's*.<sup>1</sup>

The evidence for this belief consists of the variant states of the manuscripts at the end of the *Clerk's Tale*. Manuscripts in the d\* group omit the Wife of Bath stanza (lines 1170-1176) immediately preceding the Envoy, have the Archewives stanza (lines 1195-1200) at the end of the Envoy instead of third from the end, and are unprovided with a *Merchant's Prologue*—indeed, follow the *Clerk's Tale* with the *Franklin's Tale*. Manuscripts representing the *textus receptus*, however,—El, a, b, etc.—include the Wife of Bath stanza, conclude the Envoy with line 1212 ("And lat hym care and wepe and wrynge and waille"), and follow the Envoy<sup>2</sup> with the *Merchant's Prologue and Tale*, the first line of the Prologue reading "Wepyng and waylyng, care and oother sorwe" (line 1213). These phenomena Professors Manly and Brown explain thus: the d\* manuscripts represent an early intention of Chaucer, the El manuscripts his latest. When Chaucer decided to put the *Clerk's Tale*—*Merchant's Tale* in that order in the *Canterbury Tales*, he composed the Wife of Bath stanza and inserted it before the Envoy to relate the *Clerk's Tale* to the earlier *Wife of Bath's Tale*; he transferred the Archewives stanza from last to third-from-last in the Envoy, so that the last line of the re-arranged Envoy would allude to weeping, wailing, and care; and he composed the *Merchant's Prologue*, its first line echoing the weeping,

<sup>1</sup> For Carleton Brown's views, see the following articles, especially the first and the last: "The Evolution of the Canterbury 'Marriage Group,'" *PMLA*, XLVIII (1933), 1041-1059; "The Man of Law's Headlink and the Prologue of the Canterbury Tales," *SP*, xxxiv (1937), 8-35; review of Manly and Rickert's *The Text of the Canterbury Tales* in *MLN*, LV (1940), 606-621; "Three Notes on the Text of the Canterbury Tales," *MLN*, LVI (1941), 163-175; "Author's Revision in the Canterbury Tales," *PMLA*, LVII (1942), 29-50. For Manly's views, see John M. Manly and Edith Rickert, *The Text of the Canterbury Tales* (Chicago, 1940), II, 243-244, 263-265; III, 473. My citations of the text are from this work.

<sup>2</sup> Typically, these manuscripts interpose the Host stanza (lines 1212a-1212g) between the Envoy and the *Merchant's Prologue*. I reserve discussion of this till later in my article.

wailing, and care of the last line of the Envoy, to achieve a perfect transition.

This view, I believe, has won wide acceptance, for no alternative explanation of the phenomena involved has seemed equally plausible. Yet there are certain considerations which tell against the theory; and I should like briefly to present them.

It would seem a priori that the transfer of a stanza from one position in a poem to another, two stanzas removed, would have some perceptible effect upon the smooth flow of the thought, or feeling, or expression, in the poem. It is not a matter of indifference what order the stanzas of an envoy take; they cannot be scrambled at will without some perceptible wrenching and resulting awkwardness. If this be granted, a procedure which might cast some light upon the problem of the stanzaic order in the Envoy would be the simple one of reading the piece attentively first in one order of stanzas, then in the other.

If, then, we read the stanzas in the  $d^*$  order (which, according to the theory we are testing, is the original order of composition), we discover a strange and awkward pronoun in line 1201 ("hem" referring to men) without a perceptible antecedent anywhere in the three preceding stanzas of the piece. No noun at all in the immediately preceding (that is, the third) stanza could be its antecedent; in the second stanza "clerk" (line 1185) certainly will not do, for "hem" is plural and "clerk" is singular — more importantly, the sense will not permit "clerk" to be antecedent, for "hem" refers to husbands. Not till one goes back to the first stanza does one find anything approaching a possible antecedent: here, in line 1180, two and a half stanzas before the pronoun, occurs the phrase "No wedded man," and that, we perceive at once, does not agree in number.

On the other hand, if we read the stanzas in the  $El$  order (that is, with the Archewives stanza immediately preceding line 1201 with its "hem"), we see at once that the Archewives stanza presents the antecedent for "hem" only a few lines before the pronoun:

Ne suffreth nat that *men* you doon offense (line 1197).

This connection between pronoun and antecedent seems to suggest strongly that the  $El$  order is that in which the stanzas were originally written.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> This article was written before Germaine Dempster's "A Period in the

There is another important feature of the El order which corroborates the evidence from pronoun reference: namely, the evidence from grammatical number. Read in the El order, the Envoy speaks of husbands and wives thus: stanza 1 (lines 1177-1182) in the singular; stanzas 2, 3, 4 (Archwives stanza) plus the first line of stanza 5 (lines 1183-1201) in the plural; remaining lines of stanza 5 and stanza 6 (lines 1202-12) in the singular. This pattern becomes immediately obvious if we examine the El order of the Envoy putting into distinctive type the nouns, pronouns, and verb forms which reveal the grammatical number of the spouses:

Lenuoy de Chaucer

Grisilde is deed and eek hir pacience  
 And bothe atones buried in Ytaille  
 For which I crie in open audience  
 No wedded *man* so hardy be tassaille  
*His wyues* pacience in trust to fynde  
 Grisildis for in certein *he* shal faille  
 O noble *wyues* ful of heigh prudence  
 Lat noon humilitee *youre* tonge nayle  
 Ne lat no clerk haue cause or diligence  
 To write of *yow* a storie of swich meruaille  
 As of Grisildis pacient and kynde  
 Lest Chichiuahe *yow* swelwe in hir entraille  
**Folweth** Ekko that holdeth no silence  
 But euere answereth at the countretaille  
**Beth** nat bidaffed for *youre* innocence  
 But sharply tak on *yow* the governaille  
**Emprenteth** wel this lessoun in *youre* mynde  
 For commune profit sith it may auaille  
**Ye** archewyues stondeþ at defense  
 Syn *ye* be strong as is a greet camaille  
 Ne suffreth nat that *men yow* doon offense  
 And sklendre *wyues* fieble as in bataille  
**Beth** egre as a tigre yond in Ynde  
 Ay clappeth as a mille I *yow* consaille  
 Ne dreed *hem* nat dooth *hem* no reuerence  
 For thogh *thyn housbond* armed be in maille  
 The arwes of *thy* crabbed eloquence  
 Shal perce *his* brest and eek *his* auentaille  
 In ialousie I rede eek *thow hym* bynde  
 And *thow* shalt make *hym* couche as dooth a quaille

---

Development of the *Canterbury Tales* Marriage Group and of Blocks B<sup>2</sup> and C" appeared in last December's *PMLA* (LXVIII), 1142-1159. See her footnote 6 on p. 1144.

If *thow* be fair ther folk ben in presence  
 Shewe *thow thy* visage and *thyn* apparaille  
 If *thow* be foul be fre of *thy* dispenche  
 To gete *thee* freendes ay do *thy* trauaille  
 Be ay of cheere as light as leef on lynde  
 And lat *hym* care and wepe and wrynge and waille.

With this evidence before us, is it possible to believe that Chaucer originally wrote the Envoy with the Archewives stanza at the end, breaking the pattern of plural usage and depriving "hem" of its antecedent?<sup>3</sup> Rather the Archewives stanza belongs with the whole three-stanza-long apostrophe to wives in general, in a unit, as we find it above.

If, then, the El order is Chaucer's original, how did the  $\bar{d}^*$  order arise? Certainly no one would ascribe it to Chaucer as a revision, for not only is it an inferior order with unnatural shift in number and awkward pronoun usage, but also there is no conceivable reason why Chaucer would have made the shift in this direction. It must, therefore, be scribal; and it would have been very simple indeed for a scribe to make the error. A glance at the rhymes will remind us that the Envoy is a tour de force in which all the stanzas have identical rhyme schemes. What more natural, then, than that a stanza (the Archewives) might be erroneously omitted by eye-skip?—for not only are the rhymes involved the same, but the concluding words are of about the same length and arrangement ("sith it may auaille," line 1194, to "mille I yow consaille," line 1200). Having omitted the stanza by error, the scribe who prepared  $\sqrt{\bar{d}}$  might well have perceived his error immediately after finishing the Envoy and comparing it with his exemplar. What more natural, then, than that he should seek to repair his error by simply tacking on the omitted stanza at the end? Since all the stanzas had the same rhymes, anyway, who would notice it? And since the  $\sqrt{\bar{d}}$  scribe did not have the *Merchant's Prologue*, he could not have seen any special necessity for the weeping-wailing line to come at the end of the Envoy. So the  $\bar{d}^*$  version of the Envoy came about, I

\* It is of course true that Chaucer is sometimes careless about pronominal reference and shifts in number; but his carelessness usually follows a natural pattern. For instance, the apostrophe to wives in general at the beginning of stanza 2 turns him from the singular of stanza 1 to the plural, and the possessive pronoun before "housbond" in line 1202 turns him back to the singular with its individual, personal direct address.



suggest, by a simple eye-skip and the addition of the omitted stanza at the end.

That just such an error would be characteristic of the scribe who prepared  $\sqrt{d}$  is clear from what we know of the man. Manly informs us that this scribe committed "several omissions" elsewhere in the *Clerk's Tale*; <sup>4</sup> and Mrs. Dempster speaks of "the carelessness and superficiality" of the  $\sqrt{d}$  editor's work. The correctness of the text, she tells us, was decidedly not one of his main concerns: "The worst texts in  $\sqrt{d}$  were . . . where  $\sqrt{c}$  had suffered losses [the *Clerk's Tale* comes here]. Here the scribe of the  $\sqrt{d}$  copies, whether our editor or some assistant, is no doubt responsible for countless errors, in particular for many halting lines, but probably not for much intentional innovation."<sup>5</sup> Being such a person, he could easily have been responsible for the disarrangement of the stanzas.

Another feature of the manuscripts containing the El order is that typically, though not always, these manuscripts, and almost only these manuscripts,<sup>6</sup> contain the Host stanza between the Envoy and the *Merchant's Prologue*. This, Professor Manly believes, following the lead of others, is "probably a fragment of a link written by Chaucer but discarded, though not adequately cancelled, when the standard Cl-Me Link was composed. . . . Strangely enough," Professor Manly continues, "it is preserved almost solely in MSS containing the latest work."<sup>7</sup> The presence in the El-a manuscripts of the Host stanza between the weeping-wailing last line of the Envoy and the weeping-wailing first line of the *Merchant's Prologue* has always constituted an awkwardness for those who believe that Chaucer re-arranged the Envoy stanzas to bring the weeping-wailing lines together. Had he re-arranged the stanzas with this purpose, surely he should have discarded the Host stanza. Attractive as is the theory of discard for those who believe in the Chaucerian re-arrangement of the Envoy, the plain fact is that the presence of the Host stanza in the manuscripts containing the latest work gives no support whatever to such a theory—rather the contrary. Pro-

<sup>4</sup> II, 243.

<sup>5</sup> Germaine Dempster, "A Chapter of the Manuscript History of the *Canterbury Tales*," *PMLA*, LXVIII (1948), 453-484, esp. 481-483.

<sup>6</sup> The Host stanza is found in Hg El Bo<sup>2</sup> Gg a-Ln-h\* Bw Ch En<sup>3</sup> Ha<sup>2</sup> Np Py Ry<sup>2</sup> Se, of which only Bw Ha<sup>2</sup> Ry<sup>2</sup> belong with d\*.

<sup>7</sup> II, 265.

fessor Brown, perceiving this, argued that even with the Host stanza intervening, the opening line of the *Merchant's Prologue* is "still dramatically appropriate. The merchant surely would not have forgotten the conclusion of the Envoy after these seven lines; and the echo of it in his Prologue is no less real because it is more subtly introduced."<sup>8</sup> But observe: even if we assume that Chaucer did shift the Archewives stanza, he succeeded by this shift in bringing the weeping-wailing line only six lines closer to the opening of the *Merchant's Prologue*. If the Merchant would not have forgotten after seven lines, would he have forgotten after thirteen? The echo would only have been the subtler! Since what Chaucer's shift would have gained in transition thus finally turns out to be very little, is it sufficient to base an argument for Chaucerian re-arrangement upon?

Finally, it may be observed that the theory of the scribal disarrangement of the Envoy stanzas finds no obstacle in the state of the manuscripts, either in Manly's studies of them or in the brilliant advances beyond Manly which Mrs. Dempster has made. Though it is of course theoretically possible that the  $\sqrt{d}$  editor may have based his text upon exemplars which in whole or in part consisted of early, unrevised Chaucerian versions, it is also true that in fact his texts contained errors and omissions of which he himself was indubitably guilty. Moreover, historically, in point of time, the  $\bar{d}$  texts all exist in manuscripts which are later than the manuscripts containing the *El* and the *a* texts;<sup>9</sup> and, more importantly, Mrs. Dempster has demonstrated that in tale order and partly in text, especially in text of links, the manuscripts and groups of manuscripts were successively dependent upon each other, roughly in the order Hg, *a-El*, *c*, *d*, *b*.<sup>10</sup> Our conclusion, then, that the *d* state of the Envoy is derivative and scribal, and that the *a-El* state is earlier and alone authentic, is in general accord with the history and relationships of the manuscripts.

J. BURKE SEVERS

*Lehigh University*

---

<sup>8</sup> *PMLA*, XLVIII, 1043-1044.

<sup>9</sup> See Manly's discussion in "The Order of the Tales," II, 475-494.

<sup>10</sup> See her article cited in footnote 5 above, also "The Fifteenth-Century Editors of the *Canterbury Tales* and the Problem of Tale Order," *PMLA*, LXIV (1949), 1123-1142.

## WILLIAM DUNBAR'S "STEIDIS"

The purpose of this note is to correct a small error that has appeared consistantly for over a century in all annotated editions of William Dunbar's works. This error, annoying through its persistence rather than its magnitude, appears in the notes to a little poem titled "The Manere of the Crying of ane Playe." In this poem, a monologue spoken by a dwarf representing wealth in an allegorical play, Wealth tells how he is avoiding certain war-ridden countries:

The King of Frauncis gret army  
Has brocht in dath in Lombardy,  
And in ane cuntre he and I  
May nocht baith stand perfyte.  
In Denmark, Swetherik, and Noroway,  
Na in the Steidis I dar nocht ga,  
Amang thaim is bot tak and sla,  
Cut thropillis and mak quyte.<sup>1</sup>

In 1834 David Laing, the foremost scholar of Scottish antiquities, explained the word *steidis* as "The States or government of the Netherlands." He then justified his explanation by saying that these lines "allude to the scene of cruelty begun by Charles V and perfected by Philip II in the Netherlands."<sup>2</sup> This explanation seems to have remained unchallenged until the present day. A half century after Laing's edition, Professor Schipper of Vienna translated *steidis* as "Niederlanden."<sup>3</sup> About a decade later he was followed by John Small, editing for the Scottish Text Society, who explained *Steiddis* as "States—i. e., The Netherlands."<sup>4</sup> In 1932 this explanation was repeated verbatim by W. Mackenzie (p. 229).

Lest this interpretation appear in future editions, I wish to show that it is not what Dunbar had in mind. Firstly, Laing's argument

<sup>1</sup> *The Poems of William Dunbar*, ed. W. Mackenzie (Edinburgh, 1932), was followed by John Small, editing for the Scottish Text Society, p. 173, vv. 117-134. This poem is sometimes known as "Ane litill interlud of the Droichis Part of the Play." Some critics question Dunbar's authorship.

<sup>2</sup> *The Poems of William Dunbar*, ed. D. Laing (Edinburgh, 1834), II, p. 492.

<sup>3</sup> J. Schipper, *William Dunbar* (Strassburg, 1884), p. 211.

<sup>4</sup> *The Poems of William Dunbar*, ed. J. Small (Edinburgh, 1893), III, p. 380. (STS XXI).

is invalid, since the poem was written well before the Spanish atrocities began in the Low Countries. The poem is included in the Asloan MS., which was written in 1515 when Charles V was only 15 years old and still uncrowned, in fact twelve years before Philip II was born. Not only historical, but also linguistic evidence is against Laing's theory, since the Dutch word *Staten* would retain its "t" when borrowed by the Scots.

Since the poem was written at the beginning of the sixteenth century, the word *steidis* clearly designated the Hanseatic cities (*de steden*), which had, until a short time before, dominated the trade of Northern Europe. As we have seen, Dunbar listed the *steidis* along with the Scandinavian countries, in which so many of their depots were located. An interesting parallel is found in "Colkelbie Sow," a comic-didactic Scots poem known to Dunbar. In it the swineherds dance the dances of almost every known country, including the "steidis sevin and sevinty," which, as in Dunbar's poem, are listed along with "Denmark and norroway."<sup>5</sup>

In Dunbar's poem, Wealth makes it clear that he is avoiding Lombardy because it has been impoverished by the great army of the French king. Since the poem was written no later than 1515, it probably alluded to Louis XII's campaign of 1509, in which Bayard fell, or else to the campaign of 1512, or to both. During this period the Netherlands suffered from no major war. Although there was sporadic internal warfare,<sup>6</sup> it does not seem to have expelled all wealth from the Low Countries; for in about 1510 they held most of the carrying trade in Northern Europe.<sup>7</sup>

On the other hand, the year 1509 witnessed the outbreak of the devastating struggle between the Hanseatic cities and the King of Denmark, who also ruled Sweden and Norway.<sup>8</sup> Beyond any doubt, Dunbar's poem alluded to this Baltic war, and the word *steidis* designated the Hanseatic cities.

GEORGE FENWICK JONES

Princeton University

<sup>5</sup> *The Bannatyne MS.*, ed. W. Ritchie (Edinburgh, 1930), iv, p. 293, v. 379 (STS, N. S., XXVI).

<sup>6</sup> For the political situation in the Netherlands between 1494 and 1515, see Gosses & Japikse, *Handboek tot de Staatskundige Geschiedenis van Nederland* (The Hague, 1947), pp. 293-308.

<sup>7</sup> E. Nash, *The Hansa* (London, 1929), p. 267.

<sup>8</sup> K. Pagel, *Die Hanse* (Oldenburg, 1942), pp. 482-483.

## DIOGENES AND THE BOKE NAMED THE GOVERNOUR

A great many years ago, Henry H. S. Croft<sup>1</sup> correctly surmised that the aphorism in the *Boke Named the Governour* assigned to Diogenes the Cynic was a misattribution. Sir Thomas Elyot wrote:<sup>2</sup>

Diogines the philosopher seing one without lernynge syt on a stone/sayde to them that were with him/beholde where one stone sytteth on an other.

As Croft brilliantly set forth, this saying goes back to Diogenes Laertius but not as one associated with Diogenes the Cynic; instead the maxim is attributed, in a somewhat more pointed manner, to Aristippus. This discovery led Croft (I, 112, note b) to remark that "Sir Thomas Elyot appears to be quoting from memory, and has altogether missed the point of the story which is told, not of the cynic, but of Aristippus." Subsequent to Croft's statement, I have found no specific explanation for this maxim being identified with Diogenes by Elyot, though there are many discussions of Elyot's writings<sup>3</sup> and at least one special study devoted to Diogenes in English renaissance literature has recently appeared.<sup>4</sup>

The heavy indebtedness of Elyot to the several accounts of the lives and opinions of ancient philosophers has been noted by Professor D. T. Starnes.<sup>5</sup> As the sources for the classical quotations along these lines found in Elyot's works, Starnes cites Diogenes Laertius, Burley, Erasmus and the *Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers*. So far as this list is concerned, Croft made it evident that only faulty memory could account for Elyot's citation if he

<sup>1</sup> *The Boke named the Gouvernour Devised by Sir Thomas Elyot, Knight*, London, 1883, I, 112.

<sup>2</sup> London, Berthelet, 1531 (STC 7635; PML 6346), folio 45v.

<sup>3</sup> Compare CBEL (I, 670 etc.) and "Recent Literature of the Renaissance" appearing annually in *Studies in Philology*. The latest use of the Diogenes maxim appears to be that by T. M. Pearce, "The Ideal of the Soldier-Scholar in the Renaissance," *The Western Humanities Review*, VII (1952-3), 49. There is no note here as to the "apocryphal" nature of this saying.

<sup>4</sup> John L. Lievsay, "Some Renaissance Views of Diogenes the Cynic," *Joseph Quincy Adams: Memorial Studies*, 1948, pp. 447-455.

<sup>5</sup> "Sir Thomas Elyot and the 'Sayings of the Philosophers,'" *Texas University Studies in English*, XIII (1933), 5-35.

took it from Diogenes Laertius. Further I am not aware that the maxim by Diogenes was used by Erasmus—but it does appear in both Burley's book and in the *Dictes and Sayings*. In both cases, furthermore, the aphorism is attributed directly to Diogenes the Cynic. The question that now arises is to which of these works was Elyot indebted? By a happy circumstance this can be answered with absolute certainty.

In the last quarter of the thirteenth century a Latin text made its appearance (by way of translation from a Spanish version) which has come to be known as the *Liber de dictis philosophorum antiquorum*.<sup>6</sup> Here one finds the quotation, also attributed to Diogenes, almost exactly as it stands in Elyot's *Boke Named the Governour*: "Et vidit quendam inscium stantem super lapidem; cui dixit: lapis super lapidem."<sup>7</sup> It seems unlikely, however, that Elyot could have known the Latin text which in his day remained in manuscript form and was not printed until 1854.<sup>8</sup> There are, however, works derived from the Latin text which Elyot might well have consulted. Late in the fourteenth century the Latin *Liber de dictis* was translated into French by Guillaume de Tignonville;<sup>9</sup> here the saying, assigned to Diogenes, reads: "Et vit vn fol assis sur vne fenestre auquel il dist que c'estoit pierre sur pierre."<sup>10</sup> That Tignonville could mistranslate "lapidem" as "fenestre" seems incredible; nevertheless, this reading is confirmed by the four French texts that I have at hand as well as the three English renderings made in the fifteenth century.

With two of these English versions, of course, Elyot could hardly have been acquainted since they remained unprinted until our own

<sup>6</sup> For the title of this work, see Giuseppe Billanovich, "La tradizione del 'Liber de dictis philosophorum antiquorum' e la cultura di Dante del Petrarca e del Boccaccio," *Studi Petrarcaeschi*, I (1948), reprint 15 pp.

<sup>7</sup> See Ezio Franceschini, "Il 'Liber philosophorum moralium antiquorum.' Testo critico," *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, xci (1932), parte seconda, p. 435.

<sup>8</sup> It was first printed by Salvatore de Renzi in *Collectio Salernitana*, III, 66-150 (Naples, 1854).

<sup>9</sup> A partial list of some of the numerous manuscripts and early printed editions which have survived to our day is given in my edition of *The Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers*, EETS OS 211 (1941), pp. xiii-xvi.

<sup>10</sup> Quoted from Royal MS 19 B IV, f. 18<sup>v</sup>. Similarly Morgan MS 10, f. 16<sup>r</sup>; Morgan MS 771, f. 68<sup>v</sup>; and Paris, Leber, 1533, f. 31<sup>v</sup>.



day.<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, the translation made by Earl Rivers, and printed on at least four occasions by William Caxton and his successor Wynkyn de Worde,<sup>12</sup> should have been easily accessible to Elyot. In this translation one finds the proverb (under Diogenes, of course) in these words: "He sawe also a foole sitte in a wyndowe. And he sayd/Ther sittith A stone vpon a stone."<sup>13</sup> As closely related as the maxim given by Elyot is to that in the *Dictes and Sayings*, it does seem more likely that Sir Thomas Elyot, in giving the older and more correct wording of "sitting on a stone," had made use of quite a different source.

Such a source is provided by another work, also dependent in very large measure on the *Liber de dictis philosophorum antiquorum*; <sup>14</sup> this is the *De vita et moribus philosophorum* by Walter Burley (d. c. 1345).<sup>15</sup> In this immensely popular work one finds the saying attributed to Diogenes in these terms: "Item videns quendam ydiotam sedentem super lapidem: ait Lapis sedet super lapidem."<sup>16</sup> Clearly then, so far as the maxim by Diogenes is concerned, Elyot was not necessarily guilty of a faulty memory through "misquoting" Diogenes Laertius; rather he was "guilty" of a scholarship unorthodox for his day. By turning to a non-classical source for a classical citation, Sir Thomas Elyot was following a practice which one does not normally associate with a renaissance scholar. This instance, then,<sup>17</sup> is still another example

<sup>11</sup> The English versions made by Stephen Scrope and by an anonymous translator are printed in my edition cited in note 9 above, compare pp. 66-67.

<sup>12</sup> *STC* 6826-6830.

<sup>13</sup> Westminster, William Caxton, 1477, f. 23 (*PML* 673).

<sup>14</sup> Compare Ezio Franceschini, "Il 'Liber philosophorum moralium antiquorum,'" *Memorie della R. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, CCCXXVII (1930), ser. VI, vol. III, fasc. v, p. 384.

<sup>15</sup> The *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* (Leipzig, 1925-38) lists no fewer than 12 Latin editions and 1 German printing produced before 1501 (nos. 5781-5793). The same bibliography includes 10 Italian editions under Diogenes Laertius (nos. 8385-8394) by error; these texts are primarily based on Burley's work as I have shown elsewhere ("Greek Philosophers in the Literature of the Later Middle Ages," *Speculum*, XII (1937), 451-452).

<sup>16</sup> [Cologne], Conrad Winters, [1479], sig. f8. Very similarly in three other incunabula editions in the Morgan Library.

<sup>17</sup> For another such example, see my paper "A Survival from the Middle Ages: William Baldwin's Use of the *Dictes and Sayings*," *Speculum*, XXIII (1948), 76-80.

of the hearty vitality of mediaeval "tradition" even when directly confronted by the humanistic ideals and standards of the English Renaissance.

CURT F. BÜHLER

*The Pierpont Morgan Library*

# SPENSER AND THOMAS WATSON

Spenser, in describing the flowers that grew about the arbor in his Garden of Adonis, mentioned

Sad *Amaranthus*, made a flowre but late,  
Sad *Amaranthus*, in whose purple gore  
Me seemes I see *Amintas* wretched fate,  
To whom sweet Poets verse hath giuen endlesse date.

The reference, strangely misinterpreted by recent editors, is clearly to Thomas Watson's Latin poem, *Amyntas* (1585), in which the shepherd Amyntas pours forth his grief for the death of his mistress Phyllis, and at the end stabs himself and is metamorphosed into the flower *amaranthus*.<sup>1</sup> Watson's *Amyntas*, and Raleigh's un-

<sup>1</sup> *Faerie Queene* (1590), III, vi, 45. Ralph Church, in his edition of the *Faerie Queene* printed in 1758, made the correct identification: "Thomas Watson wrote a Latin Poem called *Amintas*" (III, 140); but in the same year John Upton, in his edition, propounded the wild guess that *Amintas* was meant as a reference to Sir Philip Sidney, and later editors, even those of the *Variorum* (III, 260), have perversely followed him. See Leicester Bradner's account of Watson's poem in *Musae Anglicanae* (New York, 1940), pp. 46-47. In 1587 Abraham Fraunce paraphrased it in English hexameters as *The Lamentations of Amyntas for the death of Phillis*, without naming Watson as the author of the original. In Fraunce's phrasing, when Amyntas stabbed himself the gods

Yet lamented much, and then decreed, that *Amintas*  
Soule, should goe to the fields where blessed *Phillis* abideth,  
And bloody corps should take both name & forme of a faire flowre  
Called *Amaranthus*; for *Amintas* friendly remembrance. (Sig. E)

*Amaranthus* had been used as the name of a flower for many centuries. Thomas Cooper's *Thesaurus* (1565) describes it, on the authority of Pliny, as "An herbe, whereof be two sortes: the one with a yelow flower, called Maudlen woorte or Baltasar. . . . The other with a purple flower lyke an eare, called Flower gentle." Its being "made a flowre but late" can therefore refer only to the transformation of Amyntas in Watson's poem or Fraunce's paraphrase.

published *Cynthia*,<sup>2</sup> are the only poems by contemporary Englishmen that Spenser chose to dignify with references in the first part of the *Faerie Queene*. His praise of Raleigh, who was his distant neighbor in Ireland and who introduced him at court, is evidently a compliment to a personal friend or patron; the reason for his praise of Watson is less evident.

Though Spenser's later editors missed the reference to *Amyntas*, Watson recognized it, and returned the compliment with a graceful reference to the newly-published *Faerie Queene* in his Latin poem *Meliboeus* (1590), which he also translated into English as *An Eglogue Upon the death of . . . Sir Francis Walsingham*. There, after praising Queen Elizabeth, he said:

Yet lest my homespun verse obscure hir worth,  
 sweet *Spencer* let me leaue this taske to thee,  
 Whose neuerstooping quill can best set forth  
 such things of state, as passe my Muse, and me.  
 Thou *Spencer* art the alderlifest swaine,  
 or haply if that word be all to base,  
 Thou art *Apollo* whose sweet hunnie vaine  
 amongst the Muses hath a chiefest place.  
 Therefore in fulnes of thy duties loue,  
 calme thou the tempest of *Dianæ's* brest,  
 Whilst she for *Melibæus* late remoue  
 afflicts hir mind with ouerlong vnrest.  
 Tell hir forthwith (for well shee likes thy vaine)  
 that though great *Melibæus* be awaie:  
 Yet like to him there manie still remaine,  
 which will vphold hir countrie from decaie.<sup>3</sup>

The passage is interesting as the earliest reference to the *Faerie Queene* after its publication, and corroborates Spenser's own statement that the Queen "gan take delight" in his poem, and "it desir'd at timely houres to heare."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *Faerie Queene*, III, Prol., 4.

<sup>3</sup> Thomas Watson, *Poems*, ed. Edward Arber (London, 1870), pp. 172-173; the English and Latin versions are printed on opposite pages. Walsingham died 6 April 1590; the dedication to "Lady Francis Sydney" shows that Watson published his poem before October 16, by which date she had married the Earl of Essex. Watson later copied a stanza from the *Faerie Queene* (II, vi, 13) into sonnet 51 of his *Tears of Fancie* (1593)—see J. W. Beach, *MLN*, LVIII (1903), 218-220.

<sup>4</sup> *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* (1595), lines 361-362. The name Amyntas reappears in this poem (lines 432-443), but is here used to refer, not to Watson, but to Ferdinando Stanley, fifth Earl of Derby.

A year later Spenser continued his praise of Watson in *The Ruines of Time*, saying that as Achilles was fortunate in having a Homer to write his deeds, so Walsingham was also fortunate in having a Watson to write *Meliboeus*:

Therefore in this halfe happie I doo read  
Good *Melibae*, that hath a Poet got,  
To sing his liuing praises being dead. (lines 435-437)

Spenser probably returned to Ireland in the spring of 1591, Watson died in London the following year, and the exchange of courtesies between the two poets ceased.

This is a pretty passage of compliments, begun and ended by Spenser, in which he gave two for one. That it was prompted by personal friendship, or even acquaintance, is unlikely. It is doubtful whether the two men could have met before Spenser went to Ireland in 1580, and when he returned to England in 1589 Watson was in Newgate prison as the result of an affray, and remained there until after the publication of the *Faerie Queene*.<sup>5</sup> At this time Watson

<sup>5</sup> Mark Eccles, *Christopher Marlowe in London* (Cambridge, Mass., 1934), pp. 9-26, shows Watson was in Newgate from 18 Sept. 1589 until 12 Feb. 1590. Whether Spenser could have met Watson before he went to Ireland in 1580 is problematical. Eccles, who has presented what little is known of Watson's early life (pp. 128-159), shows that in 1577 he was thought to be leaving Douai for England, and that by 1581 he had spent seven and a half years studying and traveling in France and Italy. On the basis of a commendatory poem signed "Thomas Watson Oxon." to Greene's *Ciceronis Amor* (1589), Eccles suggests that he studied at Oxford, and that he may be the Thomas Watson who in 1579 lodged in Westminster with an acquaintance from Oxford (pp. 146, 158-159); but the Watson we are concerned with elsewhere signed himself only with the addition "Gentleman," "Londinensis," or "Iuris Vtriusque studiosus." Thomas Watson is a common name; the author of *Amyntas* may have been the Oxford student and Westminster lodger of 1579 (though if he were we wonder why he did not elsewhere sign himself "Oxon."), or he may have continued his travels on the continent until the spring of 1581. The verses before *Antigone* by Stephen Broelmann, "ex epistola quadam ad Tho: Watsonum data, dum esset Lutetiae, ut varia sua poemata in lucem exponeret" (A4<sup>v</sup>), suggest recent residence in Paris; the other contributors of commendatory verses appear to have been Londoners rather than persons recently at Oxford. But the evidence is not conclusive either way. Watson may have again visited Paris, from 25 July to 13 August 1581, with the embassy of Sir Francis Walsingham (*HMC Salisbury*, XIII, 200; *Poems*, ed. Arber, p. 157; *Vlisses vpon Aiax*, 1596, A8<sup>v</sup>).

was only beginning to receive recognition as one of the significant new poets. He had begun his public literary career in 1581 with a Latin translation of Sophocles' *Antigone*; followed it a year later with a collection of English love poems, *The Ekatompathia*; and in 1585 printed his Latin *Amyntas*. In about a dozen years he published ten books, six in Latin and four in English. The first printed notice of his work came from Thomas Nashe, who in 1589 wrote that Watson's "*Amintas*, and his translated *Antigone*, may march in equippage of honour with any of our ancient Poets."<sup>6</sup> The next printed reference to him is the *Amaranthus* passage in the *Faerie Queene*. But in the following years he received a chorus of praise from Peele, Harvey, Barnfield, Meres, Allot and others, and became so highly esteemed that the young Shakespeare was complimented by being called "Watsons heyre."<sup>7</sup>

Spenser's praise of Watson, I think, was probably motivated simply by his admiration for him as an artist. If this is so, it indicates Spenser's independence of judgment in singling out for commendation a man whose reputation was not yet fully established, reveals something about his literary taste in his evident liking for Watson's Italianate Latin finery, and shows that even in faraway Ireland he managed to keep abreast of the latest literary publications in England.

WILLIAM RINGLER

Washington University

# JONSON, CAMDEN AND THE BLACK PRINCE'S PLUMES

In Ben Jonson's *Prince Henries Barriers*, written for the creation of Henry as Prince of Wales in 1610, Merlin speaks of the Black Prince who at Crecy

teares

From the *Bohemian* crowne the plume he weares,

Which after for his crest he did preserue

To his fathers vse, with this fit word, I SERVE.

(ll. 263-66)

<sup>6</sup> *Works*, ed. R. B. McKerrow, III (London, 1910), 320.

<sup>7</sup> Arber, *ed. cit.*, pp. 11-17, collects several references. See also Thomas Edwards, *Cephalus and Procris* (1595), A2<sup>v</sup> and H3<sup>v</sup>; John Dickenson, *The Shepheardes Complaint* (c. 1596), A2<sup>v</sup>; Thomas Dekker, *A Knights Conjurung* (1607), Percy Society XXI (1842), 75.

Holinshed, from whom Jonson took much of the historical material for the *Barriers*, records that the ancient and blind King John of Bohemia was killed in this battle and that after the battle his death was mourned, but he says nothing of the plumes and does not even imply that the Prince slew him.<sup>1</sup> Jonson's source for these lines is apparently William Camden's second edition of the *Remaines . . . Concerning Britaine* (1614), published four years after the performance of the *Barriers* but before its first printing in the folio of 1616. Camden says, "The victorious *Blacke Prince* his sonne vsed sometimes one feather, sometime three . . . the truth is, that hee wonne them at the battell of *Cressy*, from *Iohn King* of Bohemia, whom he there slew: whereunto he adioyned this olde English word *IC DIEN*, that is, I serue" (p. 214).

Camden's source in turn appears to be a fourteenth-century MS, a copy of "Medica" written by the Black Prince's physician, John of Arderne, and now part of the Sloane collection in the British Museum. Next to a drawing of a plume with the legend "Ic Dien," referring to the same symbol on an earlier page, either John of Arderne or William Seton, the copyist of the MS, says, "ubi dipingitur penna principis Walliae . . . Et nota quod talem pennam albam portabat Edwardus, primogenitus E. regis Angliae, super cristam suam, et illam pennam conquisivit de Rege Boemiae, quem interfecit apud Cresy in francia."<sup>2</sup> Since in the first edition of the *Remaines* (1605) Camden says only, "the tradition is, that he wonne them at the battell of *Poitiers*, whereunto hee adioyned this old English word *IC DEN*, that is, I serve" (p. 161), he probably came upon the MS between the years 1605 and 1614.

W. TODD FURNISS

Ohio State University

---

<sup>1</sup> Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles*, 2 vols. (London, 1577), II, 934. Jonson's indebtedness to Holinshed in the *Barriers* is documented in my unpublished dissertation, *Ben Jonson's Masques and Entertainments* (Yale University, 1952).

<sup>2</sup> Sloane MS. 56, f. 74. Cf. *Boutell's Manual of Heraldry*, rev. by V. Wheeler-Holohan (London, 1931), pp. 111-12; article on the Black Prince in *DNB*.



## HUGH HOLLAND IN TURKEY

Hugh Holland is better known for his circle of acquaintances than for his writings. He was a friend of Ben Jonson, a member of the Mermaid Tavern circle, and is probably best remembered for his prefatory sonnet to Shakespeare's First Folio; but his biographers can find little to say of him beyond what is mentioned in Fuller and Aubrey. There is, however, one brief episode in his life which is recorded in some detail.

Fuller<sup>1</sup> tells us that

He travailed beyond the Seas, and in Italy (conceiving himself without *Ear-reach* of the *English*) let flie freely against the *Credit* of Queen Elizabeth. Hence he went to Jerusalem, though there he was not *made*, or he would not *own* himself, *Knight* of the *Sepulchre*. In his return he touched at Constantinople, where Sir Thomas Glover, Ambassador for King James, called him to an account for his *Scandalum Reginae* at Rome, and the former over-freedom of his tongue cost him the confinement for a time in Prison.

This was accepted by A. H. Bullen<sup>2</sup> and L. I. Guiney,<sup>3</sup> both of whom took it to mean that Holland proceeded abroad immediately after leaving Cambridge in 1597. However Glover's own account of the whole affair, preserved in the Public Record Office,<sup>4</sup> makes it clear that Holland did not leave England until after the death of Elizabeth; that he came to Constantinople before going on to Jerusalem; and that though there was trouble he was not actually imprisoned.

He was indicted for recusancy in London on February 15th, 1604/5,<sup>5</sup> but early in 1606 he obtained a license from the Privy Council to travel abroad.<sup>6</sup> In Venice he saw Sir Henry Wotton, the Ambassador there; made his way to Rome, and then to Naples; and

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Fuller, *The History of the Worthies of England*, ed. Nichols. (London, 1811.) II. 408.

<sup>2</sup> In the *DNB*, s. v. Hugh Holland.

<sup>3</sup> Louise Imogen Guiney, *Recusant Poets*. (London and New York, 1938.) p. 362.

<sup>4</sup> In *S. P.* 97/5. *State Papers, Turkey, Vol. V.*

<sup>5</sup> *London Sessions Records, 1605-1685*. Ed. Bowler. (London, 1934), p. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Referred to in L. P. Smith, *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton* (Oxford, 1907), I. 408. Glover mentions his departure soon after the execution of "the Late Traytors."

there, hearing that the newly appointed Ambassador to Constantinople, Sir Thomas Glover, was about to leave England with a very substantial gift from James to the Grand Signior, determined to go on to Constantinople to see the ceremonies that would accompany the arrival of the Ambassador and the delivery of the present. Accordingly he made his way to Chios, in the Aegean, and here, on November 10th, 1606, fell in with Glover and his retinue. Holland had left his license from the Privy Council in Venice, and Glover, not satisfied with Holland's account of himself, 'stayed him on suspicion' until he could obtain confirmation from Wotton.

The party arrived in Constantinople on December 23rd, 1606, and Holland went to live with the displaced Ambassador, Sir Henry Lello, who became engaged in a bitter quarrel with Glover, formerly his secretary. Holland took Lello's part, and was accused by Glover of having been responsible for much of the trouble that ensued. There was little Glover could do however, and when a letter arrived from Wotton confirming Holland's license, he was forced to let him depart. By the end of May, 1607, both Lello and Holland had left Constantinople; and we next hear of Holland at Venice on January 6th, 1607/8, when he obtained a letter of recommendation from Wotton.<sup>7</sup> By the beginning of 1609 he was again in London.<sup>8</sup>

Glover's account of the whole affair is preserved in the following extracts from his letters from Constantinople to James I's Secretary of State, Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury.

March 18th, 1606/7.<sup>9</sup>

... Though I am verie sorrie and noe lesse unwillinge (right hon<sup>ble</sup>) to complayne of my Prodecessor Mr Lello, yet necessitie doeth soe much urge me, beinge too too unsuportable and able to beare noe longer, his ould inveterat envie nowe breakinge out into opne mallice. First at my cominge to Constant<sup>ple</sup> (not w<sup>th</sup>standinge the extraordinarie hon<sup>rs</sup>: I shewed him, in gracinge him everie way forthe, and givinge him the upper hande untill wee appresented our selves unto the Gran sigr.) he did not onlie maligne me undeservedlie amongst his comon and familiiar frends in extenewatinge my credit and authoritie and in perticuler because he was not able in his tyme to procur to inserte this article of the merchantts foristiers in our

<sup>7</sup> Smith, *loc. cit.*

<sup>8</sup> P. R. O. MS Req. 1/199, *Witness Book of the Court of Requests*. He gave evidence before the court in the Hilary Term of that year.

<sup>9</sup> S. P. 97/5, ff. 114-116.

Capitulations,<sup>10</sup> he hath worked underhande most shamfullie w<sup>th</sup> the Frenche Ambass<sup>r</sup>. to crosse me herin, and uppon his reporte the sayed Frenche Ambass<sup>r</sup>. did not stick to tell the Vizeroyes here, that I was not the Kings Ambass<sup>r</sup>. but the m<sup>r</sup>chantts, and that I had not comission from my Kinge to worke in this bussiness of the m<sup>r</sup>chantts forastiers but it was my owne willfull doeing soe that he did his best indeuour to crosse my designes herin; yet God whoe is stronger then an envious man or the Divell, hath furthered my just cause; yet the ill will of y<sup>e</sup> sayed Mr Lello, w<sup>thout</sup> respecte of the Hon<sup>r</sup>. of his Prince, and the fame of his contrie (in myne opinion) is to be considered and at his cominge into Englande worthilie to be checked. All this obiections of myne against him (besids the reporte of men of sufficient credit) twoe principall causes makethe me to confirme in my consciens to be trewe. the first, after we have kissed the Gran sig<sup>rs</sup>. hande, from the 8. of Februarie untill this present howre, his howse being next adioyninge unto myne, he never but once or tweys vouchsafed to come to see me, neither to heare the worde of God preached, but contynewally once or tweys a weeke some tymes at night, and some tymes in the daye was in the Frenche Ambass<sup>rs</sup> howse banketinge and conferinge w<sup>th</sup> him of what matter God he best knowethe: Wheras reasone it selfe required he should rather come and asiste me if not w<sup>th</sup> his counsayle at leastwise w<sup>th</sup> his countenance but he made a manifeste shewe, as though wee were not on M<sup>rs</sup>. servantts: More over I havinge intertayned a Gentleman in Englande on Mr. Stracchi<sup>11</sup> to my Secretarie uppon just suspition and manifest reportts that whatsoever designe I had pretended against the Frenche, it was presentlie reffered unto him, w<sup>ch</sup> I suspectinge by manie circumstances (as I have above sayed) to proceede from Mr Lello. and seeinge my sayed Secretarie allsoe contynewally frequentinge his howse, gave him chardge to the contrarie; notw<sup>th</sup>standinge the sayed Secretarie not onlie almost everie night, when I and all my people were abeade by stelthe went in to the sayed Mr Lellos howse, but allsoe his M<sup>ties</sup>. l<sup>ifes</sup> to the Gran sig<sup>r</sup> I havinge givne him to translate it into Englishe, he hath not onlie shewed them unto a notorious Papist on Hugh Hollande whom I have stayed uppon a suspition, as by underwritne here y<sup>r</sup> Hon<sup>r</sup>. shall understande, but allsoe hath givne him the coppie therof w<sup>ch</sup> I doe sende y<sup>r</sup> Lordsh<sup>ps</sup> here inclosed under the sayed Hollande his owne hande for a testimonie,<sup>12</sup> w<sup>ch</sup> gave me a greate suspition that he dealte dishonestlie w<sup>th</sup> me, wheruppon I could doe noe lesse then to bid him to avoyde my howse, as reasone (I trust) it selfe required, havinge fownde him to doe

<sup>10</sup> Smaller nations traded under the protection of the greater, paying a percentage of their revenue for the privilege. At this stage the French possessed the right, and Glover was trying to regain it for the English when renewing the treaty with the Grand Signior. See G. F. Abbott, *Turkey, Greece and the Great Powers* (London, 1916), pp. 3-8, 84.

<sup>11</sup> William Strachey, first Secretary to the Virginia Colony. He was a friend of Holland's London days. See *Dictionary of American Biography*.

<sup>12</sup> S. P. 97/5, f. 76<sup>v</sup>. The document is subscribed, in Glover's hand, 'Hugh Holland his owne hand writtinge.'

things expreslie contrarie to my order, espetially in soe suspicious a tyme and manner: . . . . . Nowe concerninge the sayed Mr. Hugh Holland y<sup>r</sup> Lordsh<sup>p</sup>. shall understande, that in my voyadge to Constant<sup>ple</sup>. touchinge at an Ilande w<sup>th</sup> in the Arches of Pellagho, some 400 mille distant from Constant<sup>ple</sup> by name Sio, I founde the same man vested in longe robbes after the Greeks order, but some what bare, and understandinge him by proffetion a Scollor, and an Englishe Gentleman of 500<sup>li</sup> lande a yeare, I fell to examine him from whence he came, and for what place he was bounde, he repplyed, that uppon such a tyme he came out of Englande, (beinge litle after the execution of the late Traytors) went for Italie, and soe to Rome and thence as a pillgrime he came to Naples, and beinge there (sayeth he) understandinge of my cominge for Constant<sup>ple</sup>. w<sup>th</sup> the presente, deliberated to goe to Constant<sup>ple</sup>. to see the same deliivered; and afterwards determined to take his journey or pillgrimadge for Gierusalem, and soe for Englande; I percivinge of his beinge at Roome, by his sayed reporte, as allsoe his cominge out of Englande in soe daungerous a tyme, I begune to suspecte him not to be loyall to his Prince: and further inquiringe of what religion he was and whether he had a passe or a licence, as ordinarie gentlemen of his sorte usuallie have from the hon<sup>ble</sup>. Counsayle: he repplyed y<sup>t</sup> he was a Papiste, w<sup>ch</sup> religion he will never denie, and for the pasporte allsoe (he sayed) to have it under the kings M<sup>ties</sup>. owne hande, but (queathe he) I have lefte the same in Venice, and had not it about him, and that Sir Harrie Wotton his Maj<sup>ties</sup> Ambr. in Venice, could testifie boath the same, and of his loyaltie towards his highnes and the contrie, for that at his beinge in Venice, he hath shewed it him, yet bycause I thought it was noe reason to give credit to his bare words, I willed him to have patience, and y<sup>t</sup> he should not goe from me, untill I had sufficient certificat from the sayed Sr Harrie Wotton, of that pasporte and his loyaltie towards his soveraigne, and soe in deede I stayed him, and in the meane tyme used him not as a prysoner, but rather as my Companion, w<sup>th</sup> all gentleness possible; and nowe even 2. dayes past havinge rec'd a lre from Sr Harrie Wotton, (the coppie wherof is here inclosed)<sup>13</sup> I could doe no lesse, but to dischargdge him accordingle, whoe is nowe to departe in a Gallie for Rodes and soe for Gierusalem: he is a subtile disputer, and like a Romishe malcontente in all his argumentts (as far as he dares) contynewally malignethe our contries religion, and government.

Despite Glover's hopes, Holland was still in Constantinople on April 17th, 1607, when Lello drew up a statement of Glover's enormities, witnessed by Strachey, Holland, and a number of the English merchants resident in Turkey. Two fair copies of Lello's draft were written out in an immaculate Italian hand by Holland, one of them being addressed to Salisbury.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Unfortunately this letter is not preserved with the rest of Glover's correspondence.

<sup>14</sup> *S. P.* 97/5, f. 150. The other copies are at ff. 135, 152.

There is only one further reference to Holland in Glover's correspondence. On May 2nd he wrote again to Salisbury, announcing that Lello intended to return home,<sup>15</sup> though he does not make it clear whether Holland had already departed; and he adds

Herby y<sup>r</sup> Lordshipp may iudge the pernicious mallice of my aduersaries and in perticuller of Mr Lello and whether he be not worthie at leaste of a sharpe checke, whose dealinge w<sup>th</sup> me here hath merited severe punishment for w<sup>ch</sup> by y<sup>r</sup> Lordshp at his arrivall in Englande I hope he will be awarded. Moreover y<sup>r</sup> Lordshp shall understande, that he hath bin whollie governed and counsilled by that notorious and mallicious Papist Hugh Holland (whom my formers specified) as y<sup>r</sup> Lordshipp shall more evidentlie percive by the skill of Mr Lellos lres writen unto y<sup>r</sup> Lordship against me, for they be all of his compoundinge.

With Lello's departure the storm subsided, but it was probably the knowledge of the nature of Glover's complaints about him to Salisbury that prompted Holland to visit Wotton in Venice to obtain from him a letter of recommendation.<sup>16</sup> The quarrel was common knowledge in London. One of Glover's friends was able to warn him that Strachey, returning discontented, proposed to write a libellous book about him.<sup>17</sup> Holland, on his return, probably grumbled as bitterly. But Fuller's story, though substantially correct, contains enough distortion to make it clear that it was obtained at second or third hand.

S. G. CULLIFORD

*Victoria College, N. Z.*

#### DONNE'S "GOOD-MORROW" AND CORDIFORM MAPS

The logic of Donne's imagery in the last stanza of "The good-morrow" is most clearly demonstrable by reference to the cordiform or heart-shaped maps which were the creation of sixteenth-century cartographers and gained currency by inclusion in some of the books of the period. Though such maps are not exactly alike, the most perfect examples show 360° of the earth's surface in either a single projection or twin hemispherical pro-

<sup>15</sup> *S. P.* 97/5, f. 156.

<sup>16</sup> Smith, *loc. cit.*

<sup>17</sup> John Sanderson, *The Travels of John Sanderson in the Levant, 1584-1602*, ed. Foster (London, 1931), pp. 257-258.

jections, one northern and one southern. The heart shape is due to the upward and outward curve of the meridians from a depressed pole.

The earliest unmistakably cordiform map which I have seen was drawn by Bernard Sylvanus and appeared in an edition of Ptolemy published at Venice in 1511. Other examples are by Peter Apian (1530); Oronce Finé, who drew both a double (1531) and a single projection (1536); and Gerardus Mercator, whose twin hemispheres (1538) are famous in cartographic art.<sup>1</sup>

Donne's knowledge of and interest in maps is indicated in his prose<sup>2</sup> as well as his poetry. But it is only "The good-morrow" that involves the distinctive shape of the cordiform maps. In that poem, after saying that the two lovers, now aware of their mutual love, are just beginning to live, he introduces imagery based on the discovery of new lands and the multiplicity of worlds which maps—each one a world—will show (ll. 12-14):

Let sea-discoverers to new worlds have gone,  
Let Maps to other, worlds on worlds have showne,  
Let us possesse one world, each hath one, and is one.

The contrast is between both the newness and the multiplicity of these worlds, on the one hand, and the singleness of the world

<sup>1</sup> A copy of the Ptolemy is in the Harvard University Library. Apian's map is reproduced as Plate 71 in Leo Bagrow, *Die Geschichte Der Kartographie*, Berlin [n.d.]. Finé's maps are Plates I and V in L. Gallois, *De Orontio Finæo Gallico Geographo*, Paris, 1890. Boies Penrose, *Travel and Discovery in the Renaissance*, Cambridge, Mass., 1952, p. 258, says that the double projection of Finé appeared in the Grynaeus-Huttich *Novus Orbis*, Paris, 1532, a collection of voyages. But the three copies of that book at Harvard are without any map, and the copy at the Boston Public Library has an elliptical rather than cordiform map. The twin maps of Mercator may be found in E. D. Fite and A. Freeman, *A Book of Old Maps*, Cambridge, Mass., 1926, No. 16, and according to those writers (p. 55) were printed in Lafreri's atlas, 1575 (?), which I have not seen.

<sup>2</sup> E. g. *A Sermon Upon the xv. Verse of the xx. Chapter of the Booke of Judges*, London, 1622, p. 5: "You shal haue but two parts out of these words; And to make these two parts, I consider the Text, as the two Hemispheres of the world, laid open in a flat, in a plaine Map"; *LXXX Sermons*, London, 1640, xxvii, 268: "Take a flat Map, a Globe in *plano*, and here is East, and there is West, as far asunder as two points can be put: but reduce this flat Map to roundnesse . . . and then East and West touch one another . . ."; *ibid.*, lxvi, 672: "If you looke upon this world in a Map, you find two Hemispears, two half worlds."



which the lovers have because they constitute it, all else being excluded. At the same time, paradoxically, each has a world (having the other) and is a world (for the other to discover and have).

From this point Donne continues (ll. 15-18):

My face in thine eye, thine in mine appeares,  
And true plain hearts doe in the faces rest,  
Where can we finde two better hemisphaeres  
Without sharpe North, without declining West?

Each of the lovers sees a face reflected in the eyes of the other, and the faces, free of deceit, reveal the true feelings of the hearts. Where are two better hemispheres than these two hearts, which are without coldness and will remain constant in their love?

If Donne intended no reference to cordiform maps, the lines present a problem. Though the reader may easily think of half a heart as a hemisphere, it is difficult to see how two hearts could represent only two hemispheres. Donne is saying that each heart is a hemisphere: the two hearts together make one world. There is just such a depiction of two hearts, each a hemisphere and both together forming one world, in the double cordiform maps of Finé and Mercator. It is likely, therefore, that for both Donne and his contemporaries the connection between the image of hearts and the image of hemispheres had a logic that modern readers can reconstruct only by a knowledge of the old maps to which I have referred.

ROBERT L. SHARP

Wheaton College

---

#### "A BOOK WAS WRIT OF LATE . . ."

Construed by the letter, the last lines of Milton's *Tetrachordon* sonnet—

Thy age, like ours, O Soul of Sir *John Cheek*,  
Hated not Learning wors then Toad or Asp;  
When thou taught'st *Cambridge* and King *Edward* Greek—

ought to mean that, within limits (not worse than toad or asp), both generations hated learning, for the sonnet leaves no doubt that

Milton's did so. "Thy age" is "like ours," and Cheke's learning is thus distinguished from surrounding ignorance: "As that dull age to thee, so this dull age to me." This reading imposes no such grammatical strain as taking the phrase *like ours* to qualify the verb in the following line—"Thy age . . . hated not learning as ours does"—though the sense here yielded is that preferred by editors. For its sake two of them have suggested that *like* in line 12 means *unlike*.<sup>1</sup> By the meter we may know that Milton did not write the longer word, and if he meant it, his usage appears by the *NED* to be his mere mistake. If we must assume a mistake, it would be as convenient to find it in line 13, blame the printer, and alter *not* to some other monosyllable, perhaps *all* or *good*: "Thy age, like ours, . . . Hated good learning." But this is essentially, it seems to me, what the lines say without change.

We should perhaps not make our choice of the possibilities until we have taken into account what Milton's age, unlike ours, thought of Cheke's. It may be too easily taken for granted that the poet meant compliments where he intended none. Respectable history told how the rapacity that had followed upon the fall of abbeys had brought learning to the brink of ruin. Warmly though Milton's contemporaries admired Cheke, Ascham, Bucer, and Fagius as learned Protestants working against odds, they did not suppose that in their day either culture or respect for it had been general, at any rate not so general as the vandalism that John Bale had deplored and, long after him, Thomas Fuller. Milton should have read of it, though hardly for the first time, while he was occupied with Bucer's writings.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> David Masson, ed. *The Poetical Works of John Milton* (3 vols., 1890), III, 283; William Bell, ed. *Milton's English Sonnets* (London, 1938), p. 197. Cp. A. W. Verity, ed. *Milton's Sonnets* (Cambridge, 1933), p. 42.

<sup>2</sup> Martin Bucer, *De Regno Christi*, in *Scripta Anglicana* (Basle, 1577), pp. 61-63. For more testimony to the decay of learning, with university enrollment down to one tenth of normal, see Bernard Gilpin, *A Sermon . . . at Greenwich before King Edward* ([1552] 1630), p. 23; Hugh Latimer, *Sermons*, ed. John Watkins (2 vols., 1824), I, 93-95, 159, 245, 267; Thomas Lever, *Three Sermons* [1550-1551], ed. Edward Arber (1870), 120, and cp. intro., 12-14; Thomas Starkey, *England in the Reign of King Henry the Eighth* (Part I), ed. S. J. Herbage (*EETS*, 1878 and 1927), pp. xlvii and lxxvi; esp. John Bale, ed. *The Laboryouse Journey and Serche of John Leland* (1549), Pref., A7-E8<sup>vo</sup>. See Thomas Fuller, *History of Cambridge* (vii, 15-16), ed. James Nichols (1840), p. 173, and *Church History* (vii, xvi, 19), ed. Nichols (3 vols., 1868), II, 360.

Only four or five years before he wrote his sonnet, Cheke's name had been made public in precisely this connection. *The True Subject to the Rebell* had been reissued by the elder Gerard Langbaine, who supplied a biography of the author and a preface that pointed Cheke's tract against the Puritan "sedition" of 1641. He raked out of the earlier century a lamentation for universities scorned and emptied, for libraries pillaged to supply grocers with paper. Milton could have written into his sonnet a half-conscious memory if controversy had actually brought before him in 1641 a book that set off Cheke's learning against a background of dismal obscurantism.

Even if he had read Langbaine's preface or its idea in a dozen other books, it will not follow irresistibly, of course, that he shared the idea. Yet where he appealed to prejudice he should have been controlled to some extent by the opinions of his audience.

HOWARD SCHULTZ

University of New Hampshire

---

### EIKON BASILIKE, EIKON ALETHINE, AND EIKONOKLASTES

It is the received view that Bishop Gauden's authorship of the *Eikon Basilike* remained a close secret until 1690, when the Anglesey Memorandum initiated the violent debate that was to be protracted over two centuries. Thus F. F. Madan writes: "Although doubts as to the authenticity of the *Eikon* followed closely upon its first publication, a few days after the execution of the King, the initial stages of the controversy produced little on either side. If the Royalists were inclined to regard doubt as sacrilege and unworthy of reply, their opponents, even with Milton's aid, could only hint at some forger or collaborator, as to whose identity no one had any clear idea." (*A New Bibliography of the Eikon Basilike*, Oxford Bibliographical Society Publications, New Series, Vol. III, 1950, p. 126.) Indeed, the point may seem to be almost self-evident, for had the Council of State known the forger of this most damaging of all royalist propaganda, would it not have proclaimed and denounced him in every news-sheet and in a hundred pamphlets?

I suggest, nevertheless, that the truth was known to the Com-

monwealthsmen virtually from the outset, or, at the least, strongly suspected by them. *Eikon Alethine*. *The Pourtraiture of Truths most sacred Majesty truly suffering, though not solely*, the first set-piece attack on the *Eikon Basilike*, was published anonymously in 1649; Thomason dated his copy August 26th. Its main argument is that the *Eikon* is a forgery which "traduces" Charles; i. e., since it contains much that Charles demonstrably knew to be untrue, he emerges not as misled but as a "superlatively cunning Hypocrite" (A1r). Madan says that "the unknown author attributes the *Eikon* to some presumptuous priest or ambitious prelate" (p. 137). I think the writer knew that Gauden was the author of the *Eikon*, made numerous allusions to him, and counted on their being understood. These allusions are of three kinds: a reference to a well-known work of Gauden's, much bitter play upon his name, and a biographical allusion.

*The Religious & Loyal Protestation of John Gauden Dr. in Divinity; Against the present Declared Purposes and Proceedings of the Army and others, about the trying and destroying our Sovereign Lord the King. Sent to a Collonell, to bee Presented to the Lord Fairfax, And his Councell of Warre, this fift of January 1648 [1649]* was published January 15th. The preface explains why Gauden thought it his duty to publish what had originally been written as a letter of private advice. The letter itself protests his good will to Fairfax and the Army, but urges them to draw back from the trial of Charles. If they do, it concludes, "the world shall see your power bounded with Loyalty, sanctified with Piety, and sweetned with Pitty, not foolish and *feminine*, which I would have below you, but *masculine*, Heroick, truly Christian and Divine" (p. 11). In *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, which appeared four weeks later, Milton pounced upon this rhetoric of masculine and feminine, and made it into a label for Gauden: "Neither let milde and tender dispositions be foolishly softn'd from thir duty and perseverance, with the unmaskuline Rhetorick of any puling Priest or Chaplain, sent as a friendly Letter of advice, for fashion sake in privat, and forthwith publisht by the Sender himself, that wee may know how much of friend there was in it" (*Columbia Works*, v, 5). It is by this phrase that Milton's allusion to Gauden has been identified (*The Tenure*, ed. W. T. Allison, 1911, pp. 68-69). The *Eikon Alethine* employs the same label, adapting it to the traditional distinction between the strong fist of logic and

the graceful palm of rhetoric: "manly logick must prevaile against the allurements of effeminate Rhetorick" (A3<sup>v</sup>).

Puritan pamphleteers liked to exploit the opportunities for scornful allusion implicit in Gauden's name. The final section of *Mirabilis Annus Secundus, or The Second Year of Prodigies* (1662), which records the "eminent and signal Judgements, that have happened to several Ministers, that have been drawn to do things against their Light and Conscience," is careful to name all the other Anglican clergymen whose hostility to Puritanism was punished by a revenging God, but not the unlucky Gauden, afflicted with "strangury"; him it identifies by the adjective readily derivable from his name: "About the Month of *January*, 1661, a reverend gaudy Prelate, did put forth a Book in Print, Intituled, 'A Pillar of Gratitude'" (p. 86). The author of *The Anatomy of Dr. Gauden's Idolized Non-sence and Blasphemy* (1660) uses the same adjective: "I have now taken my walk through your gaudy Field: but have gathered little fruit" (p. 28). He also varies the taunt, using a synonym for one of the meanings of gaudy: "a flashy Advocate" (p. 6); and *The Covenanters Plea against Absolvers. Or, A Modest Discourse, shewing Why those who . . . took The . . . Covenant cannot judge their Consciences discharged . . . by any thing heretofore said by the Oxford Men, or lately by Dr. Featly, Dr. Gauden, or any others* (1661) rings another change: "If our Brethren have any more strong Arguments, let them bring them forth; only . . . we have had enough gay words" (Aa4<sup>v</sup>). The *Eikon Alethine* is full of this kind of allusion. The Doctor who wrote the *Eikon Basilike*, it asserts, did it "In a gaudy phrase, that those fools, who . . . guesse of a mans worth by his gaudy outside, might . . . think it the late Kings, because of the embroidered apparell" (A1<sup>v</sup>). "Gaudy phrase" occurs again at p. 1, and "bravery of the phrase" at p. 7. The "seduced people of England" are asked, "will you adore a Devill if he be but gaudily drest" (A3<sup>r-v</sup>)? The *Eikon Basilike* is declared to consist of "fopperies" (A3<sup>r</sup>); it is "falshood spangled with twinkling pretences" (A3<sup>v</sup>), the Doctor hoping that "he may so dazle our eyes with its brightness, that his falshoods may steale away undiscovered" (p. 8). These last plays involve the contemporary use of "gaud" to mean, besides a bright ornament, "a device to deceive" (*N. E. D.*, sb.<sup>2</sup>, 1) and hence of "gaudy" to mean "full of trickery" (*N. E. D.*, a.<sup>2</sup>, 2); and these meanings underlie the assertion that the *Eikon* is a false

image made by a priest "whose name if known by you, would have made you conclude that it could not be true" (A3<sup>r</sup>). There may also be an allusion to Gauden's first name in the verses,

And thou (right reverend Levite) didst presume  
None would thee *Jack-Daw* know i'th' *Eagles* plume (Aa1<sup>v</sup>).

"*Jack-daw*" is repeated at p. 47.

The verse epistle, "The Authour to the Doctor, upon his *Eikon Basilike*," includes the following passage:

What cause so great could move thee to such rage?  
That *Englands* ruine onely can asswage  
Thy furious soule. What, hath she crost thy fate,  
And thou receiv'd repulse when candidate? (Aa1<sup>r</sup>).

Gauden was certainly angry at his exclusion from the Westminster Assembly in 1643. On the eve of the Restoration he was still complaining about it in print: "my self were by I know not what sleight of hand shuffled out of that Assembly, to which I was as fully chosen as any" (*Ecclesiae Anglicanae Suspiria*, 1659, p. 377). Wood explains that Gauden "was nominated . . . by sir Dudley North and sir Tho. Chichley . . . to sit among them, but . . . Mr. Tho. Goodwin was substituted in his place, as a person more fit for the great designs then carrying on" (*Athenae*, ed. Bliss, III, 612).

Taken alone, this biographical allusion could be made to fit others as well as Gauden, but in conjunction with the clear reference to the *Religious & Loyal Protestation* and the relentless play on the name it confirms that the author of the *Eikon Alethine* knew that Gauden wrote the *Eikon Basilike*; and if he knew it, it can hardly be doubted that so did the Council of State to whom he dedicated the book. And certainly Milton knew more than he made explicit when, in October, he raised very briefly the question of "the Author of these Soliloquies, whether it were undoubtedly the late King, as is vulgarly beleev'd, or any secret *Coadjutor*, and some stick not to name him" (*Eikonoklastes*; Columbia, v, 72). Even if the author of *Eikon Alethine* can be supposed not to have passed his information to the Council, Milton had read his book carefully and used it to good purpose, as has been pointed out by William Haller (*Columbia Milton*, v, 323) and J. H. Hanford (*A Milton Handbook*, 1946, pp. 108-9); he could not have failed to recognize the label he had himself attached to Gauden.



But, it will be asked, if the Council and Milton knew that Gauden was the author of the *Eikon*, why did they not expose the forgery? It would be idle to suppose that they hesitated because they lacked positive confirmation: Thurloe, of all men, would have got confirmation; and in any event the man who belabored Morus in *The Second Defence of the English People* would not have hesitated to attack Gauden because of some trifling uncertainty.

We cannot do more than guess at the Council's motives, but we may begin by suggesting that if it had arrested Gauden and committed its counter-propaganda irretrievably to the line that the *Eikon* was a forgery, it would probably have entrapped itself. The royalists would then have been free to make of Gauden, who was never loved or trusted by his own party, the perfect all-purpose scapegoat. They could have begun with a limited admission: Gauden had prepared for publication materials originally provided by Charles. (This would have had the advantage of being approximately true, and the question of how much Charles had furnished could have been evaded.) They could have conceded that it was an excess of zeal for Gauden to suppress his own role in the published book, while insisting that his role had been a secondary one and that the substance of the book was Charles's. Thereafter, any really damaging Commonwealth criticism of the *Eikon* would always have met the perfect defence: the objected passage was Gauden's, not Charles's.

May we not think that the very able tacticians of the Council perceived this danger? If so, it would seem reasonable for them to plan their counterattack in two phases. The first probing thrust, in late August, is represented by the *Eikon Alethine*. Although in fact probably commissioned, it would be privately published, anonymous, and would commit no one. It would argue that the *Eikon Basilike* was a forgery, and give the contention some weight by liberal and transparent hints of the forger's identity. The Council could then wait to see what effect this line was having. If it disconcerted those who were newly attracted to the crown, it could then be pressed home; Gauden would be arrested, and the Council would commit itself to this position.

But the public response was in fact very different. Despite the *Eikon Alethine*, underground editions of the *Eikon Basilike* continued to follow hard upon each other's heels, and in tens of thousands of homes a new, uncritical, and emotional image of Charles

was fast replacing the old distrust. Even the most convincing demonstration that Charles had had what Milton called a *coadjutor* would have had little effect, for this sympathetic audience would at most have taken it to mean that while the new image of the late king came to them with the help of a second hand, it was the king's work in substance.

The Council therefore took the alternative line in the second phase of its attack, represented by the *Eikonoklastes*. This, published in October, is in effect an official document: "I take it on me as a work assign'd," (v, 64) writes the Council's Latin Secretary. It does not precisely repudiate the argument of the *Eikon Alethine* (the "secret *Coadjutor*" reappears briefly as a stylist [p. 112], a compiler [p. 213], and a prompter [p. 232]), but it treats it as immaterial, and strikes straight at Charles. "As he, to acquitt himself, hath not spar'd his Adversaries, to load them with all sorts of blame and accusation, so to him, as in his Book alive, there will be us'd no more Courtship then he uses; but what is properly his own guilt, not imputed any more to his evil Counsellors, (a Ceremony us'd longer by the Parlament then he himself desir'd) shall be laid heer without circumlocutions at his own dore" (p. 66). Milton's whole effort is to elicit, from the same materials as produced the idealized image of Charles, a second image of a consummate and tyrannical hypocrite. It is hard to be sure whether this was really more effective than the forgery argument: the *Eikon* continued to be very influential. But the royalists' special hatred of Milton, whom they listed just below the actual regicides as a public enemy, may indicate that they assessed the counterattack initiated by the *Eikonoklastes* as a greater check than that initiated by the *Eikon Alethine*.

ERNEST SIRLUCK

University of Chicago

---

### THREE NOTES ON "ROCHESTER'S" POEMS

#### I. Rochester's *Farewel*, ll. 37-42.

The author of this satire, whether Rochester himself or not, writing in the Spring of 1680 devotes much space and sarcasm to "the Tangier bullies" as he calls them, *i. e.* the English expedi-

tionary force that was being raised in order to relieve that city, besieged by the Moors. Among those prospective heroes two are presented in well-balanced lines:

Let *P*[timout]h, or let *M*[ordan]t go, whom Fate  
Hath not made Valiant, but desperate.  
For who could not be weary of his Life,  
Who's lost his Money, or has got a Wife?  
To the more tolerable Alcaid of *Alcazzer*,  
One flies from Creditors, the other from <*Frazier*>;

The first two names are filled in by an anonymous annotator of the British Museum copy (1077 h. 3) of *The Third Part of the Collection of Poems on Affairs of State* . . . London, 1689. The former (Charles Fitzcharles, Earl of) Plymouth, one of the Merry Monarch's nineteen acknowledged bastards, was fated to die at Tangier the next October 17, aged twenty-three, and need not detain us here. But in the latter we must recognize a man of future eminence: in 1680 he was only Charles Viscount Mordaunt, but he was to become the third Earl of Peterborough at his uncle's death in 1697 and later to play an important part in the War of the Succession in Spain.

Now who is the third person named in this passage? Professor Pinto, Rochester's latest and most helpful annotator, dismisses, rightly, the reading "*Torrezer*" found in the above-mentioned collection, adopts that of "*Frazier*" from *Poems on Affairs of State* . . . 1697, and concludes: "The reference is to Sir Alexander Fraser the well-known court physician." But surely symmetry requires here not a man but a woman, not an M. D. but a wife. And, once we have identified "Mordant" as the "Mordaunt, Charles" in the *D. N. B.*, a look at the article will tell us that he had married, in 1678, being barely twenty years old, Carey or Carry, daughter of Sir Alexander Fraser of Durris in Kincardineshire. Whether the lady had really proved more of a terror than the Moors we cannot tell, but the ungallant satirist certainly says so in plain terms.

## II. *A Satyr (Semper Ego Auditor Tantum, etc.)*, l. 33.

Even more doubtfully Rochester's (in fact Professor Pinto relegates it to the Appendix) this piece ends with twelve lines enumerating persons then alive nobody would care to change places

with; the first is the King, the last but one his Laureate. Our concern here limits itself to one of much less note; says the 1707 edition of Rochester's poems:

Who'd be that patient *Bardash* S——y, (rhyming with "be").

Professor Pinto annotates: "This must be Francis Talbot Earl of Shrewsbury, husband of the notorious Anna Maria Brudenell, Countess of Shrewsbury, mistress of the Duke of Buckingham. Shrewsbury was killed in a duel with Buckingham in January 1668." But, since l. 35 refers to the Rose Alley Ambuscade on December 16, 1679, Professor Pinto admits that the dating of the piece offers a difficulty, which he attempts to solve by conjecturing that the final couplet was added after "Dryden's skin" had been "cudgel'd." Yet there opens a far easier way out. The earldom had not become extinct in 1668; the title was worn for the next fifty years by the son of Buckingham's victim, Charles Talbot, twelfth Earl (in fact he was created a duke in 1694). And the satirist, who would most likely have called the father a "cuckold," seems to have had sufficient reason for calling the son a "Bardash," *i. e.* "a catamite" (*O. E. D.*). We can at least guess so much behind the decorous phrases of Dr. John Tillotson, then Dean (and later Archbishop) of Canterbury. A letter of his to the hopeful young nobleman (born in 1660) begins: "It was a great satisfaction to me to be any ways instrumental in the gaining your Lordship to our religion"—the Earl, educated in the Roman Catholic Church, had "for the first time attended [the Dean] at the public worship in Lincoln's Inn Chapel, on Sunday the 4th of May 1679"<sup>1</sup>—but proceeds to deplore that the convert's conduct should ill agree with the purity of his new religion: "The time I last waited upon your Lordship, I had heard something that afflicted me very sensibly; but I hoped it was not true, and was therefore loth to trouble your Lordship about it. But having heard the same from those, who, I believe, bear no ill-will to your Lordship, I now think it my duty to acquaint you with it. To speak plainly, I have been told, that your Lordship is of late fallen into a conversation dangerous both to your reputation and virtue. . . ." True he adds later: "I hope in God, no temptation has yet prevailed on your

<sup>1</sup> See Thomas Birch, *The Life of . . . Tillotson . . .* London, 1752, pp. 57-60, where the letter is given in full.

Lordship so far as to be guilty of any loose act. If it has, as you love your soul, let it not proceed to an habit." But this charitable construction the satirist did not adopt; hence the coarse and infamous epithet that to this day sticks to *this* Earl of Shrewsbury.<sup>2</sup>

### III. *Tunbridge-Wells*, ll. 63-74.

Though not claimed for Rochester before 1697 this witty satire really seems to be his. A well-known passage hits at Samuel Parker, then (1675) Archdeacon of Canterbury and later to become Bishop of Oxford. Rochester calls him "*Bayes*," the nickname lately given him by Andrew Marvell in both parts of *The Rehearsal Transpos'd*. After describing "A Tribe of Curates, Priests, Canonical Elves," Rochester introduces Parker thus:

Listning, I found the Cobb of all the Rabble,  
Was pert *Bayes*, with Importance comfortable:

Professor Pinto annotates: "Cobb the name of the garrulous water-bearer in Ben Jonson's *Every Man in his Humour*." I can see little that the water-bearer and the dignitary have in common, and so I stick to my earlier interpretation<sup>3</sup> of "Cobb" as "A great man, big man, leading-man" (v. *O. E. D.*, s. v. cob, sb., sense 1).—As regards "Importance comfortable" Professor Pinto rightly notes that Marvell "twits Parker for his use of the phrase 'Matters of a closer and more comfortable importance,'" but he does not follow up this clue, and very few readers unacquainted at first hand with *The Rehearsal Transpos'd* will guess that "Importance" had become, under Marvell's pen, "a female"<sup>4</sup> and is presented as such by Rochester. British Museum Add. MS 34, 362. f. 23 contains a version of the poem with two additional lines (after Pinto's l. 74) that leave us in no doubt on this point:

Importance drank too, tho she'd bene no sinner  
To wash away some dreggs he had spewd in her.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Pinto's tentative identification of "Henningham" in l. 5 of the same piece, with the Sir William Heveningham who was buried on October 14, 1674 lies open to the same objection as that of "Shrewsbury" with Francis Talbot and must, I think, be rejected, but here I cannot propose any substitute.

<sup>3</sup> See *André Marvell* . . . Paris, 1928, p. 371, n. 87.

<sup>4</sup> *The Rehearsal Transpos'd*, p. 8 (Grosart, III, p. 10). The phrase became current for a few years as the quotation from Dryden's *Limberham* in *O.E.D.* shows.

We may even surmise that Rochester exactly means by "Importance" the wife Parker took to his bosom between the two parts of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, about the time he himself was writing his *Reproof* to the first part if we are to believe the second part (p. 59). In this rejoinder Marvell not only indulges in indelicate jesting about Parker's courtship of his wife (p. 169) but charges Parker with saying that she was "a goddess," something of a blasphemy on the tongue of an archdeacon. And this rather sanctimonious gibe of Marvell's occurs in an unsavoury passage (pp. 9-17) where he plays with the idea that Parker's disease, the "lazy dull Distemper" (cf. l. 71 of *Tunbridge-Wells*) he had so imprudently invoked to account for his delay in issuing the *Reproof*, might well be "the pox." Rochester's inference could not but follow, and Marvell, rather than he, should bear the blame for this coarse slander.

PIERRE LEGOUIS

University of Lyons

---

### CHATEAUBRIAND'S *ITINÉRAIRE DE PARIS À JÉRUSALEM* AND POE'S "THE ASSIGNATION"

In the *Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem* (1811) Chateaubriand suggests that he may have made an exciting discovery during his visit to the site of ancient Sparta.

Il y avoit à Sparte une foule d'autels et de statues consacrés au Sommeil, à la Mort, à la Beauté . . . divinités de tous les hommes . . . : rien de tout cela n'est resté; mais je lus sur une espèce de socle ces quatre lettres ΑΑΣΜ. Faut-il rétablir ΓΕΑΣΜΑ, *Gelasma*? Seroit-ce le piédestal de cette statue du Rire que Lycurgue plaça chez les graves descendants d'Hercule? L'autel du Rire subsistant seul au milieu de Sparte ensevelie offriroit un beau sujet de triomphe à la philosophie de Démocrite! <sup>1</sup>

When Chateaubriand wrote, after his visit to the ruined city of Leonidas, "j'ignore si mes recherches passeront à l'avenir," he could hardly have anticipated that his supposed Altar of Laughter would survive, not in the annals of Sparta, as he might have wished,

<sup>1</sup> *Oeuvres complètes de Chateaubriand*, nouvelle éd., V: *Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem* (Paris: Garnier frères, s. d.), p. 157.



but in "The Assignation (The Visionary)" of Edgar Allan Poe, whose unhappy hero shows a remarkable familiarity with Chateaubriand's text:

"Do you know, however," said he musingly, "that at Sparta, which is now Palaochori—at Sparta, I say—to the west of the citadel, among the scarce visible ruins, is a kind of socle, upon which are still visible the letters ΛΑΣΜ. They are, I verily believe, part of ΓΕΛΑΣΜΑ. How many divinities had altars at Sparta, and how strange that that of Laughter should be found alone surviving."<sup>2</sup>

ALFRED G. ENGSTROM

*University of North Carolina*

---

### THE ART OF REFLECTION IN JAMES'S *THE SACRED FOUNT*

James uses the art of reflection in varying degrees in nearly all of his novels; it is as characteristic of his art as his style. But seldom does he use it with as great a degree of abstractness as in *The Sacred Fount*. The reading of any novel by James is an intellectual experience among other values, but the reading of *The Sacred Fount* must be an almost exclusively intellectual experience if it is to be anything at all for the reader. The richness and range of human experience is largely lacking in this novel, and even the intellectual content is made somewhat tedious by the over-elaborate details and ramifications of the narrator's impressions and reflections.

The narrator of the novel is The Observer. Other of James's detached observers—Longmore and Winterbourne, for example—experience, learn, change; but it is as though detached observation and intellectual reflection were to the narrator of *The Sacred Fount* a profession rather than a vital emotional experience. "Reflection," he says, "was the real intensity. . . ." Thus the narrator is a static character, and since little happens in the novel except that we are told it happens through the reflections of the narrator, the narrative also is static.

<sup>2</sup> Edgar A. Poe, "The Visionary," Godey's *The Lady's Book*, VIII (January, 1834), 42.

Paradoxically, *The Sacred Fount* is diffuse although it has all the elements necessary to achieve tightness of form and structure. It has a singleness of idea developed into a single line of action. It has a concentration of time and setting (a weekend party), and a limited number of characters, grouped in contrasting pairs, about which a limited problem or segment of experience is the central light. Yet though the pattern is there, the material out of which the pattern is woven is thin. One reason for this quality of diffuseness is that James took a simple idea, excellent for a short study, and elaborated it into a three hundred page novel without much extending its scope or significance.

What would have served well for a short story is spread thin in an elaborate but static narrative. James himself came to the same conclusion about *The Sacred Fount*, when he wrote to Howells late in 1902, it "is one of several things of mine, in these last years, that have paid the penalty of having been conceived only as the 'short story' that (alone, apparently) I could hope to work off somewhere (which I mainly failed of) and then *grew* by a rank force of its own into something of which the idea had, modestly, never been to be a book."<sup>1</sup> Seeing the weakness of *The Sacred Fount*, James did not include it in the New York edition of his works.

CHARLES G. HOFFMANN

*University of Rhode Island*

---

#### THE STRUCTURE OF "A ROSE FOR EMILY"

If analyses in periodicals and inclusion in anthologies are a dependable criterion for a short story, William Faulkner's "A Rose for Emily" is not only his best story, but also one of the best written by any modern American writer. Most of these treatments have especially noted the conflicts in the story between the past and the present, the South and the North, the old and the new, the traditional and the traditionless, and the gentility and the middle-lower class.

<sup>1</sup> *The Letters of Henry James*, ed. Percy Lubbock (New York, 1920), I, 408.

Faulkner's structural problem in "A Rose for Emily" demanded that he treat all of Miss Emily's life and her increasing withdrawal from the community and that by extreme selection he give a unity, a focus to these conflicts. Thus he divided the story into five parts and based them on incidents of isolation and intrusion. These divisions have a perfect symmetry that is encountered often in the works of Hawthorne but seldom in those of Faulkner. The contrast between Emily and the townspeople and between her home and its surroundings is carried out by the invasions of her home by the adherents of the new order in the town. Each visit by her antagonists is a movement in the overall plot, a contributing element to the excellent suspense in the story, and a crisis in its own particular division of the story.

In youth Emily is not wholly separated from her somewhat sympathetic environment. In later life, however, she withdraws more and more until her own death again exposes her to the townspeople. In part one there is one invasion: after several notifications, the Board of Aldermen enter her home in a futile effort to collect her taxes. The second part describes two forced entrances into her isolation, both of them caused by a death. Four men cover her lawn with lime and break open her cellar door to sprinkle lime there, hoping to stop a terrible odor—though they are not aware that it is caused by the rotting corpse of her poisoned lover; the burial of her dead father, the purpose of the second intrusion, is accomplished only after three days of persuasion.

The inviolability of Miss Emily's isolation is maintained in the central division, part three, in which no outsider enters her home. Her triumph is further revealed in this part when she buys the arsenic without telling what she plans to use it for. Like the second part, the fourth contains two forced entrances. The Baptist minister calls upon Miss Emily to chide her for the disgrace to the town caused by her affair with the Yankee Homer Barron; and a letter from the rebuked minister's wife causes the second intrusion, a visit from her relations in Alabama. The symmetricalness of the story is rounded out in the fifth part when the horde comes to bury a corpse, a Miss Emily no longer able to defy them.

This structural pattern, unnoticed in any of the previous analyses of the story, makes "A Rose for Emily" as symmetrical as *The Scarlet Letter*, with the platform scenes at beginning, middle,

and end. Faulkner has made the form a perfect vehicle for the content. At the center of the story is the indomitableness of the decadent Southern aristocrat, and the enclosing parts reveal the invasion of the aristocracy by the changing order.

FLOYD C. WATKINS

Emory University

### THE FATE OF *LA CHOSE PUBLIQUE* IN MODERN FRENCH-ENGLISH DICTIONARIES

*La chose publique*, a literal translation of *res publica*, is found for the first time in the XIV century: "*chose publique ce n'est autre chose mes que l'estat publique ou commun, et non general a touz estaz de terres, pais, royaumes et citez.*"<sup>1</sup> Here, as you will note, the meaning would be "the republic." Alain Chartier in the following century uses it in his *Quadrilogue invectif*: "*et tellement est la chose publique muee et changiee de sa nature qu'entre l'impetuosit  des armes se taisent les lois,*" . . .<sup>2</sup> Here, the meaning is "the State."

Either or both of these meanings are the ones given in a number of standard French lexicographical works of reference: *Dictionnaire de l'Acad mie Fran aise*; E. Littr , *Dictionnaire de la langue fran aise*; *Dictionnaire encyclop dique Quillet*; *Encyclop die universelle du XX  Si cle*; *Nouveau Larousse universel*; Hatzfeld et Darmest ter, *Dictionnaire g n ral de la langue fran aise*. On the other hand, Bescherelle A n , *Nouveau Dictionnaire national*, gives *le bien commun*; the *Grand Dictionnaire universel du XIX  Si cle*, *les int r ts de l' tat, de la nation*; and *Larousse du XX  Si cle*, * tat, gouvernement, int r ts g n raux du pays*.

Although only one of all the afore-mentioned authorities gives both ideas cited, we know that both are correct and that, as in Latin in the case of *res publica* or simply *res*, *la chose publique* may be defined as follows: "the State," "commonwealth," "government," "republic;" also, "commonweal."

<sup>1</sup> Bercheure, *Tite-Live*, mentioned in La Curne and Godefroy's supplement.

<sup>2</sup> G. Paris et E. Langlois, *Chrestomathie du moyen  ge*, p. 254.

Let us now proceed to examine the lexicographical material on *la chose publique* in a number of representative French-English dictionaries. J. MacLaughlin<sup>3</sup> gives "the common weal." E. Clifton and J. McLaughlin<sup>4</sup> give "the commonweal," "the commonwealth." Spiers and Surenné<sup>5</sup> limit themselves to "commonwealth." Guiraud<sup>6</sup> gives "the commonweal." With reference to Guiraud, it is to be noted that in the English-French part he defines *commonweal*: 1) *bien public*, 2) *république, société*. This unacceptable<sup>7</sup> acceptation, 2), is also found in Elwall.<sup>8</sup> Consequently, one is led to assume that they are using *commonweal* in its current meaning and its now, generally considered, archaic signification. In Cassell<sup>9</sup> under *chose* you will find: "the commonwealth," "State," under *public*, no cross-reference, "the common weal," "the State." In the English-French part one finds after *commonweal*: "*bien public*," after *commonwealth*: "*république*," "*état*." One wonders how the editor understood *commonweal*. The *Concise Oxford French Dictionary* gives under *public*: "the general weal," "the State," under *chose*: "the commonweal." In the English-French part "*chose publique*" is found after *commonweal*, and "*république*" after *commonwealth*. Willcox<sup>10</sup> gives "the State." Finally, we come to *Heath's Standard French and English Dictionary* and note: *la chose publique*, "the common weal," "the public welfare," "the public service," clearly, to be taken as synonymous. Even here, the basic meaning, "State," "commonwealth," is missing. It is interesting to note that in the English-French part *la chose publique* correctly covers both ideas of *commonweal* and *commonwealth*.

<sup>3</sup> J. MacLaughlin, *A New French-English and English-French Dictionary*.

<sup>4</sup> E. Clifton and J. McLaughlin, *A New French-English and English-French Dictionary*.

<sup>5</sup> Spiers and Surenné's *French and English Pronouncing Dictionary*.

<sup>6</sup> J. Guiraud, *Dictionnaire français-anglais, anglais-français*.

<sup>7</sup> V. The *Oxford English Dictionary*, vol. II, C: "In sense 2 (commonwealth) it was in 16th c. more esp. Scotch and is now archaic or rhetorical, or used with etymological emphasis." *Webster's New International Dictionary*, Second Edition Unabridged and *Funk and Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary of the English Language* tersely state "archaic" for this sense.

<sup>8</sup> A. Elwall, *Dictionnaire anglais-français*.

<sup>9</sup> Cassell's *New French-English English-French Dictionary*.

<sup>10</sup> C. Willcox, *French-English Military Technical Dictionary*.

In view of the general unsatisfactory treatment of this expression in both French and French-English lexicons as outlined above, it seems meet to point out that the full definition is as indicated in paragraph three.

J. PODGURSKI

New York

---

## REVIEWS

---

*Tamburlaine's Malady and Other Essays on Astrology in Elizabethan Drama.* By JOHNSTONE PARR. University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1953. Pp. xiv + 158. \$3.50.

In this book the student of the English Renaissance will find further evidence of the important part which astrology played in the lives of the Elizabethans. Professor Parr has set out in these essays to discover how far and with what dramatic significance astrology was used by the playwrights of the period. Within the limits of the plays which he has chosen to investigate, the author has succeeded in his design, and has as well provided interesting reading. At times one detects an excess of enthusiasm, as when we are asked to believe that the ordinary theater-goer would immediately characterize Chapman's Byron as a man destined to an adverse fate because of a malignant *Caput Algol*; or that the audience would know that matters concerned with business were governed by the planet Mercury; but on the whole, scholarly restraint is maintained.

The book consists of twelve essays of varying length, together with a bibliographical survey of the sources of astrological knowledge for the Elizabethans. Of these essays, six have appeared previously in the periodicals. In the leading essay Professor Parr undertakes to prove that Tamburlaine's death is brought about by his inordinate passions, and that the physician thoroughly understands the medical and astrological aspects involved in his diagnosis of Tamburlaine's illness. The reader is thus provided with another facet to Tamburlaine's many-sided character, although your reviewer wishes to plead a demurrer to Professor Parr's thesis that all preceding interpretations of Tamburlaine are inadequate. In the following chapter we learn that one of Tamburlaine's foes, the witless Mycetes, is a foolish man because his natal horoscope finds Saturn posited in conjunction with Luna. In the next essay the astrological "characters" which Faustus inscribes in his circle are for the first time clearly explained by reference to Agrippa's *De occulta philosophia*. The author then maintains that Lyly's



giving to astrology such a large part in a literary composition is a novel idea, apparently neglecting for the moment Greene's *Planetomachia*, although the last footnote to this chapter quotes Bond that the *Planetomachia* is a source for Lyly's play. Chapter five gives a fascinating delineation of Ateukin as an astrologer whose deductions from James IV's horoscope seem fairly accurate, though they are obviously based upon extra-scientific information. It is rather strange to find that one of the authorities for this chapter is one Zadkiel, a nineteenth century astrologer, whose *The Grammar of Astrology* was published in 1852. In the chapter entitled "Shakespeare's Artistic Use of Astrology" the author gives a somewhat cursory survey of the subject. He wonders if John of Gaunt is speaking astrologically when he calls England "this seat of Mars," and finds it odd that Falstaff refers to takers of purses as being governed by the Moon, since it is Mercury which rules thieves. Professor Parr concludes that it is unlikely that Shakespeare has a serious mistrust of astrology. Chapter seven presents an excellent discussion of eclipses and their consequences to man, explaining that the effects of a lunar eclipse would last as many months and the effects of a solar eclipse as many years as the eclipse lasts hours. Professor Parr discovers in the following chapter that Gloucester's bastard is "a Martial man with strong Venerian proclivities" because Ursa Major is dominant in his horoscope, and believes that this is the answer to Bradley's question how so young a man as Edmund could be so evil in nature. The next chapter is on Chapman's *Byron*, and is followed by a chapter on *The Duchess of Malfi*, in which the fatal horoscope is discussed, although the play ends before the accuracy of the horoscope may be tested. An entertaining account of how an astrologer would go about catching a thief or finding stolen goods is presented in chapter eleven; it is based chiefly upon William Lilly's *Christian Astrology* (1647). The last chapter investigates the use of physiognomy, chiromancy, metoposcopy, and astrology in *The Alchemist* and shows that the play conforms to the tenets set out by Richard Saunders' *Physiognomy* (1653). Following these essays Professor Parr gives a suitable bibliographical survey of Renaissance astrology. This account will be useful to scholars in the field in providing a summary of the astrological books used by the Elizabethans. Although the bibliography is a select list, there are a few surprising omissions, such as the important astrological pamphlet by Himbert de Billy, which Professor Parr discovered and which he uses as a chief source for his chapter on eclipses; or Thomas Heth's confutation of Richard Harvey's *An Astrological Discourse*.

The book contains a slight number of errors in proofreading: "dias" for "dais" on page 39, the "s" omitted from "whoremasters" on page 108, and the "ed" omitted from "renowned"

on page 117. On page 60 there is an omission of the words "being governed" in the quotation from *1 Henry IV*. Edgar's phrase, "sectary astronomical," means a believer in astrology and not an astrologer or practiser of astrology as indicated on pages 65 and 79. Ursa Major is improperly known as the Big Dipper, since the latter is only the seven bright stars in the former. Some exception may also be taken to the handling of references, though there is nothing serious enough to be misleading.

Some of the problems of the book seem to have arisen from a reluctance to delete insignificant sections when rewriting a dissertation from a more mature point of view. This book, however, is quite worth reading and will well repay the student for his time. Professor Parr has contributed to our understanding of many obscure dramatic passages, and to a better understanding of the Elizabethan mind.

CARROLL CAMDEN

*The Rice Institute*

---

*The Sense of Shakespeare's Sonnets.* By EDWARD HUBLER. *Princeton Studies in English* No. 33. Princeton U. Press, 1952. Pp. 169. \$3.00.

Just because they are imprecise in biographical detail and so little of an explicit series, Shakespeare's Sonnets have long been the happy-hunting ground of legend-makers and scandal-seekers. Mr. Hubler is neither of these: he has no romantic theories, no new 'Mr. W. H.' or Dark Lady to suggest. He is inclined to accept the late Tucker Brooke's ingenious but arbitrary arrangement "in the order of the events of all ill-starred amour (compliments, invitations to love, consummation, joy, weariness, rejection)"—as if there were only *one* order for an ill-starred amour. But fortunately Mr. Hubler is not concerned with the order of the Sonnets; his seven essays discuss how some leading ideas and attitudes in the two main groups of poems reveal the complexity of Shakespeare's mind. He pays tribute to the literary historians, but makes a fresh approach, and if he discusses such matters as wit-play, the Petrarchan convention and Platonic ideas of friendship at a rather elementary level it is probably to cater for his less scholarly readers.

Mr. Hubler begins by showing some difficulties of the Shakespearean sonnet form, and in particular the difficulty of getting climax in the three quatrains without breaking the sonnet's back or reducing the couplet to a mere appendage. Success almost always comes "when the parts of the sonnet stand in a 'When I, Then I, Then I, So' relationship, or in some variant of it." He sees that quite a number of the couplets are merely tags. These failures are

usually due to "the sonnet form which he chose and to his impatience with formal problems." There may also be a deeper reason. Many of the sonnets had a double motivation. Actuated by friendship or love they were also an opportunity for the poet to discuss wider topics; and this Shakespeare commonly did so independently and with such power or charm that the particular application to compliment became not so much what Tucker Brooke called 'a note of sincere and simple verity' as a strained anticlimax. The poem is a unit chiefly when the philosophy of love is implicit throughout.

Mr. Hubler next examines the nature of Shakespeare's feeling for the Dark Lady. From the first it is 'neither dignified nor prettified' but frank and realistic, enjoying the lust which it sees as wrong only when no union of true minds is achieved. There are some good comments here, but in the light of the author's argument it is surprising to find Sonnet 138 described as presenting "a mood of amused contentment" with the fact that love is an affair of 'lying' and its 'best habit is in seeming trust.' Is there not a tinge of bitterness in the piece? 'Seeming trust' Shakespeare never thought best. Mr. Hubler's book traces well the development of moral feeling through the Sonnets. He might have made even more of the falsity, the lying which Shakespeare saw as the sin against the Holy Ghost.

The early exhortations to the young man to 'breed' are related to classical and mediaeval traditions of plenitude. Shakespeare's delight in physical beauty becomes increasingly involved with ethical doubts as the darker sides of the boy's nature are revealed. The difference between appearance and reality becomes a grief to the poet, who strives to keep his admiration and affection for his friend. (His indulgence is, we may note, at times quasi-paternal). Professor Hubler gives the best analysis I have read of the young man's faults, notably as revealed by Sonnet 94, the criticism of those "Lords and owners of their faces" who deny the natural (and Christian) law of stewardship and responsibility for their brethren. This theme recurs later in the plays.

Mr. Hubler follows familiar lines in his handling of Shakespeare's humility, even bitterness, about his own profession and class, the Fortune

'That did not better for my life provide  
Than public means which public manners breeds.'

so that he 'Gor'd his own thoughts, sold cheap what is most dear.' One wonders whether the profundities of the later plays came partly from a conscious desire to improve the status of dramatic entertainment and with it the author's own professional self-respect. For Shakespeare's humility was the obverse of an inordinate worship of reputation.

Mr. Hubler enters a useful caveat against some modern religious

propagandists in criticism. He insists that although Shakespeare was Christian in basic assumptions, his work had a 'secular frame of reference.' No theologian, he recognised that earthly goodness involved not only an acquaintance with evil but even a passage through it, an idea which produced *Othello* and *King Lear* and was adumbrated in Sonnet 119

'O benefit of ill! now I find true  
That better is by evil shown made better . . .'

The book is not a complete study of the 'sense' of the Sonnets; it has little to say of Time and Change and other important topics of Shakespeare's speculation; nor is the substance of the imagery deeply exploited. But by its commonsense and liberality, its illuminating interpretations of some individual sonnets, it is a useful contribution to our appreciation.

G. BULLOUGH

*King's College, London*

*Answerable Style: Essays on Paradise Lost.* By ARNOLD STEIN.

Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1953. Pp. ix + 166. \$3.50.

This volume contains six essays, of which three have been previously published, on aspects of *Paradise Lost*. The essay on "Satan" attempts, by an analysis of structure and style, to show that Satan is neither a tragic hero nor an absurd villain, but is in a position in which he can win the struggle against good only by allying himself with good. That on "The War in Heaven" asserts that the war is not "a realistic war to be taken quite literally" (p. 17), but "part of a complex metaphor," in the mood of a "great scherzo, like some of Beethoven's—with more than human laughter, too elevated, and comprehensive, and reverberating not to be terribly funny" (p. 20). The chapter called "A Note on Hell" attempts to show that "the broad and powerful effects . . . of defiance and achievement" in Milton's Hell "play against a small and telling counterpoint" (p. 38) which deserves notice. The fourth essay, on "The Garden," is directed toward a demonstration that "Milton's main task in presenting Paradise is to create a commanding image of the archetype, to rediscover for us our idea of Paradise—and at the same time not to sacrifice the perspective of the larger plan" (p. 61). There is hence a doubleness in the Garden which requires the maintenance "of continuous counterpoint even in resolution" (p. 62). Milton contrives to suggest, in the very process of creating an archetypal image, that in other places and times there *will* be fear lest dinner cool: "Implicit in

the state is its loss" (p. 73). In varying degrees all four of these essays are cogent, perceptive, and responsible both to poetic sensation and to the historical and ideological matrix.

The remaining essays are longer. The title essay, "Answerable Style," although highly creditable to the author, is not in my opinion the best in the volume. The style is answerable to the need of Milton's Idea "to realize itself through rising to Subject and Argument" (p. 120). The need includes a commitment to the Renaissance concept of epic, to the concept also of Christian epic (which "links this poem to Scripture, to doctrine, to concepts of biblical style and inspired Christian eloquence"—p. 121), and, finally, to the "as yet *unattempted*" (p. 122). The discussion attempts to work toward the general problem thus defined by confronting "some of the immediate problems that Milton must have had to solve in order to solve his larger problem of building styles into style, variety into unity" (*ibid.*), the immediate problems chosen for exploration being those of "the dramatic," of diction, of sound-structures, and of imagery. The final emphasis is on an "extraordinary complexity that is at last most impressive for its clarity" (p. 154). With the exception of some questionable remarks on sound-structures (comment on "the brassy gurgle of the *l*" in II, 515, on the repetition, in the "*flew*" of X, 284, of the *w* in "*wide*," etc.—pp. 145, 149, and *passim*), the discussion is sound and helpful; but the comparatively narrow focus prevents it from being more than richly suggestive.

The most impressive chapter of the six is that on "The Fall," which is both subtler and more profound than other treatments of the subject. Adam's danger is "the Eve within himself" (p. 77); Eve's fault is the violation of order through self-love, first hinted in the innocent admiration of her own image in the pool, implied again by the terms of Satan's invitation in the dream, still further defined by her insistence on working apart from Adam "because she has nominated the value" (p. 95), and finally yielded to in the temptation proper. Adam has also been "involved in three preliminary gestures that tend to violate order" (p. 101), all suggesting a kind of indirect narcissism in his attitude toward Eve. Thus "up to the Fall the unmoved center of drama is the Idea of order, which defines the violation upward and the violation downward" (p. 116); but after the Fall the highest value ceases to be knowledge, which includes the recognition of order, and becomes love, through which man fell. The only part of the argument which fails to carry full conviction is the proposal that the myth is partly based on a Platonic concept of struggle between the soul (Eve) and the intellect (Adam); but even this theory is provocative.

Much has been accomplished by Mr. Stein in these essays. Here, at last, is "new" criticism of Milton which does not resist the tendency of the text to force reading against a seventeenth-century

background. Moreover, Mr. Stein obviously likes Milton. He has not had to constrain himself to discover in *Paradise Lost* merits his instincts deny. His criticism is perceptive, sympathetic, and knowledgeable all at once; so that *Answerable Style* is a notable contribution to Miltonic criticism.

Two reservations may be offered. The first is that the conclusions lack viability. One rises from the book with the sense that reading it has been an experience worth having, but also with an uncomfortable feeling that the experience is not easily renewable, that to have it again one must either restudy an elaborate synopsis or retrace the whole ground step by step. The cause may lie in Mr. Stein's reluctance to generalize his concrete findings in abstract summaries—a reluctance for which I have attempted to compensate in my recapitulations—or it may be traceable to the fact that his conclusions tend rather to *be* data than to *rest on* data. In any event, the portable image of the book is likely to be rather that it contains admirable chapters on such-and-such subjects than that it advances such-and-such interpretations.

Secondly—and this weakness is intimately related to the first—not every essay fuses into wholeness. The impression is that Mr. Stein, having settled on a receptive attitude, reread the poem many times, murmuring to himself during one set of readings "Satan," during another set "Hell," and so on. The compositional problem thus became that of arranging his successive perceptions in an orderly train. The final arrangement is always skillful and sometimes orderly, but it has grown by agglutination and is not always dominated by a total vision. This is a pity, for the artist works from—or achieves—such a vision, and the critic's interpretation is most sensitively responsive when it proceeds from an identical vision arrived at by an act of imaginative sympathy.

WAYNE SHUMAKER

University of California,  
Berkeley

---

*Jonathan Swift and the Anatomy of Satire. A Study of Satiric Technique.* By JOHN M. BULLITT. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953. Pp. viii + 214. \$4.00.

Mr. Bullitt's method, which has its advantages, entails a number of problems. Bullitt proposes to analyze Swift's "technical accomplishments" as a satirist. His first two chapters deal with the nature of satire in general and with Swift's use of various techniques appropriate to the satiric mode. In the long third chapter, "The Rhetoric of Satire," he sets up several categories derived from Aristotle's *Rhetoric*—the example, the enthymeme, the maxim, etc.—and analyzes a considerable number of passages



from Swift's major and minor works according to the categories. This is the most successful part of the book. It is interesting and illuminating, for example, to see a complex passage from *An Argument Against Abolishing Christianity* reduced to the form of an enthymeme and submitted to logical analysis (pp. 92-95). All readers are doubtless aware of Swift's comically unscrupulous use of illogical logic, but it is good to see precisely and in detail how this kind of thing works. Bullitt does this well; and the advantage of the method is that he can bring together relevant examples from the whole of Swift's work. The disadvantages are implicit in Bullitt's conception of technique which is apparently limited to the notion of an isolated manipulation of language for a local effect. Throughout the book there is no sense of satirical technique as informing the structure of any given work. Consequently we have analysis of discrete passages only; no work is considered as an artistic whole, and the effect inevitably is scrappy and, after a time, tedious. This is particularly true of the later chapters in which Bullitt uses Bergson's theory of comedy—especially the fruitful concept that comedy derives from “something mechanical encrusted on the living”—somewhat as he has used Aristotle. But the Bergsonian categories overlap badly; and, despite some good insights, we get a repetitious catalogue of the *kind of thing* Swift ridiculed (mechanical ways of thinking, principally), rather than analysis of the *method* of ridicule.

The book suffers from a curious kind of historical distortion. For example, Bullitt writes (p. 76) that Shaftesbury contributed respectability to “satire through ridicule” by his theory that ridicule is “a test of truth”; then follow several pages of discussion of the involved eighteenth-century controversy over the function of ridicule. Bullitt quotes Akenside, Fielding, Hutcheson, Lord Kames, Gerard, Nowell, John Brown (at considerable length), and others—all of whom wrote a half century or so after *A Tale of a Tub* and well after Swift was dead. (Incidentally, Shaftesbury did not say that ridicule was a test of truth, although for over a hundred years the remark was almost universally attributed to him; see A. O. Aldridge's exhaustive treatment of the eighteenth-century controversy over ridicule in “Shaftesbury and the Test of Truth,” *PMLA*, LX [1945], 129-156.) In an earlier (and often parallel) discussion of ridicule (pp. 24-37) Bullitt has cited Socrates—but then jumps to Akenside, Brown, Kames, and the rest, concluding that Swift and these men justified satire by appealing to its moral usefulness. Surely there needs no Akenside to tell us this; and Horace's *ridiculum acri / fortius* . . . is much more to the point than anything John Brown (1751) wrote. The incongruity of all this is pointed up by the curious sequence of tenses in a sentence of Bullitt's: “Just as Akenside and Brightland had perceived the ineffectiveness of unmitigated angry abuse, so Swift recognized that . . .” (p. 35).

Some of Bullitt's analysis is vitiated because he fails to indicate just what Swift is up to. A striking instance is his elaborate discussion (pp. 97-104) of the technique of Swift's *Abstract of Mr. Collins's Discourse of Freethinking*, where he treats the work as though it were an independent ironic essay: "His [Swift's] method is simply to introduce each one of a series of propositions (to which, of course, he subscribes) by the phrase 'it is objected that . . .,' and then to refute these propositions with mere cavils." The fact is that *Collins* introduces the propositions by "it is objected that. . . ." Swift is paraphrasing throughout (so closely indeed that Leslie Stephen recommends reading Swift, with appropriate "toning down," rather than *Collins*), and Bullitt's analysis is off the point. Swift's well-known phrase "the bulk of mankind is as well qualified for flying as thinking" is taken from a sentence beginning "But to this it may be objected, that the bulk of mankind . . ."; and the whole thing is a paraphrase (and lovely caricature) of *Collins's*: "*It is objected, That to suppose Men have a right to think on all Subjects, is to engage them in Enquiries for which they are no ways qualify'd; the Bulk of Mankind really wanting a Capacity to think justly about any Speculations. . . .*" Bullitt, like many others, makes the error of using the "flying . . . thinking" remark as evidence for Swift's "disillusionment in the rationality of man" (p. 20).

There are other historical problems—Bullitt's opinion, for example, that in the eighteenth century the word *furniture* used in relation to a person's mind had the primary sense of "a mechanical object," like something one buys in Macy's (pp. 153, 169, 182)—but a word should be said of his critical position. "Perhaps the ultimate difference between the satire of Swift and that of most of his contemporaries," writes Bullitt, "is that Swift really cared" (p. 38). Ignoring the aesthetic implications of this remark (which seem to me untenable), the problem for Bullitt, as regards *Gulliver's Travels*, is whether Swift cared too much; for, in satire, "an apparent detachment from too intense a personal involvement is the necessary precondition to greatness" (p. 39). From time to time Bullitt seems to hold that in the final Voyage Swift maintains ironic distance between his feelings and those of Gulliver (pp. 43, 67, 192?); but most of the time it is clear that he is of the Thackeray-Macaulay camp in believing that Swift and Gulliver are one, that Gulliver's raw misanthropy is a direct expression of Swift's own feelings: "Gulliver—and Swift—identified man's actuality with the Yahoos . . ." (p. 15); Gulliver's "devastating disgust . . . is uttered in the voice of his creator" (p. 66); much of the satire in the final Voyage is "a direct and unequivocal statement of Swift's own conclusions about life" (p. 151). The point seems to be clinched by an interesting slip; the cow, around which revolved the hypothetical litigation described by Gulliver

in his talks with his Houyhnhnm master, is by the commerce of the unconscious given by Bullitt to Swift; the suit is over "one of Swift's cows," he says (p. 150). This is like saying (without Freudian overtones) that Gertrude is Shakespeare's mother. Well, if Gulliver's cow is Swift's cow, and if Gulliver's hatred is Swift's hatred, there can be none of that detachment which is the prerequisite of the greatness that Bullitt ascribes to the work. It is my own belief that the critical approach exemplified here, with its confusion of biography and criticism, is demonstrably in error and leads inevitably to a false judgment of the work of art.

ROBERT C. ELLIOTT

Ohio State University

---

*The Life and Activities of Sir John Hawkins: Musician, Magistrate and Friend of Johnson.* By PERCY A. SCHOLÉS. Oxford University Press, 1953. Pp. xiii + 287. \$7.

The life and reputation both contemporary and posthumous of Sir John Hawkins is a paradox. Consider this man's extraordinary career: Beginning quite humbly, "as office-boy to an attorney's firm," he curtailed his hours of sleep, rising at four in order to read law and literature. His diligence procured him opportunities and time to cultivate his artistic inclinations. He wrote verse and prose for the magazines, and his lyrics were set by the blind organist Stanley and performed with popular success at Vauxhall. He became acquainted with other prominent musicians, notably with Handel, and with amateurs in music, distinguished in other professions and in social circles: William Caslon, Sir Samuel Dukinfield, Dr. Lawrence, and Dr. Pott. He joined the newly established Academy of Ancient Music and the Madrigal Society. At thirty, he was invited into Johnson's Ivy Lane Club, and soon after he married a fortune. His marriage seems to have been entirely successful and happy. With increased means, he improved his surroundings and widened his circle of acquaintance. He moved to Twickenham and to Hatton Gardens, and raised a family. He became well acquainted with his neighbor, Horace Walpole, and undertook more ambitious literary projects. He brought out an annotated edition of Walton's *Angler* that at once became standard, going through at least ten editions. At Walpole's suggestion, he began to collect materials for the first considerable history of music in English. He kept up his professional activities, and became a London magistrate, annually donating his fees to the relief of the parish poor. He was elected chairman of the Middlesex Quarter Sessions, and held this office for fifteen years. As his interests broadened, he appears to have relinquished very

few of his earlier ones. He became one of the original members of the Literary Club; and in the same year (1763) drew up a compendious document on the state of the highways, aimed at improving their maintenance and reducing the multifarious laws concerning them to a single statute. This, together with his later work on an act controlling the turnpike trusts, brought him the offer of a seat in Parliament. It is therefore not surprising to find him receiving a knighthood a few years later. In 1776, his imposing and laborious history of music appeared in five volumes quarto, and dedicated to the King. Whatever its deficiencies, this work was important enough to be reprinted in a third edition a hundred years after its first appearance. In the Gordon riots of 1780, Hawkins was called upon to play a responsible part as a city magistrate. Four years later, he was asked by Dr. Johnson to be one of his three executors; and in that capacity wrote the earliest full-length life of the first man of letters of his Age. Soon after this work was published, Hawkins himself died, having the happiness to see all his children likely to survive him for many years, and leaving among them a daughter whose filial piety would ensure the exercise of her literary talents in his behalf.

Surely, this is a chronicle of outstanding and earned success: the outline of a life of unusual achievement in Law, in Public Service, in Music, in Letters, and in Social Eminence. In all these circles, Hawkins was at home. He knew many of the most interesting people of his day, and was himself a noticeable figure. He did not waste his time, but devoted it to a continual succession of laudable pursuits. He exhibited no incapacitating weaknesses of character:—no serious vices, either ignoble or splendid; and he acted in the public interest. He lived worthily and commendably. Yet for at least the last twenty-five years of his life—the years of achievement—he was hounded by sneers and disparagement in almost everything he did. And during the subsequent century and a half, the reputation of the “Musical Knight” has rested almost exactly where Boswell dropped it. Burney’s name continues to grow and smell sweet; while that of Hawkins, with five times his actual achievement of work performed, goes on bearing the crabs of yesteryear, as if there were something inherently silly about a knight who happened to be musical.

It cannot honestly be said that Dr. Percy Scholes has done very much either to explain the paradox or to make a living person out of the nominal existence. This new biography is all too palpably an affair of scissors and paste. It is not careless: the author has read and considered Hawkins’ writings and the evidence bearing upon him and them:—the long reviews in the magazines and the gossip of contemporaries; the special inquiries of recent investigators like Dorothy George; and first, last, and continuously the effusions of Laetitia Hawkins, whose words about her father and

what concerned him are quoted at length on nearly every page, and which to subtract would leave the present work little more than an outline of a biography. Most certainly, one who touches on the social history of that time is at a disadvantage. Hawkins' contribution to the entertainment at Vauxhall invites some description of the Gardens and of what went on there. But it would have been safer to forgo the temptation: the passages in the magazines, in the periodical essays, and in the contemporary novels and letters are too familiar to be freshly available for quotation. Still more certainly, one who writes of anything that concerns Johnson runs a much greater risk. It is surely dangerous to review the membership of the Literary Club with brief catalogue entries after each name. But to quote the famous paragraph in which Boswell describes his first meeting with Johnson, by way of identifying Tom Davies as Hawkins' intended publisher, can only be set down as the maddest self-indulgence.

The author has a bleakly ungraceful habit, perhaps useful in reference works, of making his transitions in the form of a question as topic sentence, followed at once by the appropriate reply. For example: "What part did Hawkins take in the performances of these various musical coteries or clubs?" (Answer follows.) "Was Hawkins a composer?" (Answer follows.) "What personal contact did Hawkins have with Handel?" (Answer follows.) And perhaps most distressing of all, the chapter heading, "How was the 'History' received?," followed by the *réponse*: "How was it received? Not well! And poor Hawkins must have felt very inadequately repaid for his sixteen years of toil," etc.

From a musician of Dr. Scholes's encyclopaedic knowledge and authority, we naturally expect to be amply enlightened by a critical discussion of the *History* which forms Hawkins' chief claim to remembrance. But here our disappointment is most acute. From some unhappy scruple or timid fear of becoming uninteresting to the general reader, Scholes devotes a bare five pages to a descriptive review of the work, beginning with an excerpt from the preface and three brief paragraphs on the contents of the Preliminary Discourse. Next comes a complaint of the lack of systematic arrangement, and a quoted example of repetition in chapters 175 and 184. Having told the reader on one page that the work brings the subject down no later than Handel and Geminiani, the author returns on the next to cite omissions, and exclaims over Hawkins' failure to mention Dr. Arne, "born only nine years earlier than he, and active in London musical life up to the very period of the publication of this book! (What lies behind that? Can there have been animosity? But even so—!)" Surely many a historian or anthologist—say Thomas Warton, for example, or Quiller-Couch in his *Oxford Book of English Verse*—has preferred to stop short of his exact or younger contemporaries, about whom, perhaps, his judgment would be three parts in four personal preju-



dice or current fashion. Hawkins, it is admitted, was an antiquary. Nor is it in the least surprising that he neglected English folk-music, a subject that has not even yet come in for any serious historical treatment. We are told that Hawkins, like Burney, was mistaken about the Puritans' attitude to music, and unjust to Bach. "So," proceeds Dr. Scholes, "one might go on! But adequately to analyse Hawkins' *History* would be a long task and one calling for many pages in the presentation of the result." He concludes that, in view of the fact that the author was an amateur in music, "the book really does him some credit." (!) He has already observed in the first footnote to this chapter: "It is worth recalling that some of the most valuable later writers on musical-historical subjects have been amateurs, e. g., Jahn, Thayer, Chappell, and Grove."

The biography proper contains a good deal of information not hitherto brought together, and makes it readily available. But on the whole, Fétis' words on Hawkins' history, and the approving comment by Scholes, may be cited now as an apt characterization, *mutatis mutandis*, of the present biography: "A proprement parler, le livre de Hawkins n'était point une histoire de la musique, mais un recueil de bonnes matières pour cette histoire." And much of the material is indeed 'bonne.' To this day the book remains a quarry for other authors seeking building material."

BERTRAND H. BRONSON

University of California,  
Berkeley

---

*The Thespian Mirror: Shakespeare in the Eighteenth-Century Novel.* By ROBERT GALE NOYES. Providence: Brown University, 1953. Pp. v + 200.

*An Introduction to Eighteenth-Century Drama, 1700-1780.* By FREDERICK S. BOAS. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953. Pp. x + 365. 25s.

When a modern novelist wishes to talk about the plays of Shakespeare, he sends Stephen Dedalus into the Dublin Library or has Slim Sarrett write a graduate term paper, but when an eighteenth-century novelist wished to do the same thing he sent one of his fictional characters to the Drury Lane Theatre to watch David Garrick portray a Shakespearean role. And Professor Noyes wisely cuts off his account before Jane Austen, as she breaks the pattern to modulate into another one. *The Thespian Mirror* is a systematic and comprehensive study of the way in which eighteenth-century novelists regarded Shakespeare and his plays. And the referent was not the printed text but the illumination of the text by the interpretation of an actor on the stage before an audience. Not



only has Dr. Noyes made an exhaustive search for completeness of coverage in eighteenth-century fiction and demonstrated a wide knowledge of the periodicals; but he has also shown equal familiarity with modern scholarship. The result is a book packed with information and highly reliable. Furthermore, the person who is organizing for publication a project which overlaps several "fields" would do well to use Dr. Noyes' fine book as a model.

A similar knowledge of the period and familiarity with the scholarship do not extend to F. S. Boas's *Introduction*, a work devoted to presenting synopses of selected plays. It is difficult to learn his principles of selection. He includes authors as minor as Chetwood, but omits Hoadly, Foote and Macklin. He starts bravely enough, summarizing all eight of Rowe's plays, but this plan soon dwindles to an account of only three of Cibber's twenty-two offerings and only two each of the plays of Arthur Murphy and Richard Cumberland. Presumably well known plays like *She Stoops to Conquer* and *The School for Scandal* are treated in full detail. Even the synopses are not entirely satisfactory. He misunderstands neo-classic satiric practices (p. 60) by considering Aimwell (instead of Archer) the protagonist of Farquhar's *Beaux Stratagem*, and is lulled by Goldsmith's style into denying that *The Good-Natur'd Man* is a satire. Consequently, his synopsis is faulty because he takes the gull for a straight lead.

He dabbles with added information. Sometimes he lists the source of a play; on another, he is silent. Sometimes he gives bibliographical information about editions; other times he does not. He pauses to speak of the widespread influence on continental drama of Lillo's *London Merchant*, but denies such an influence for *Fatal Curiosity* (p. 251) or is silent when dealing with *The Devil to Pay* or *The Constant Couple*. He will also include, occasionally, the date of first performance or some notes on stage history. Here his unfamiliarity with primary sources or modern scholarship betrays him. He dilates on the success of *The Beggar's Opera*, saying that it had a run of 63 days (p. 184); actually, it had a consecutive run of 32 performances followed by 30 intermittent productions for a total of 62. He says that Cumberland's *West Indian* had "an initial run of thirty nights"; actually, it was performed three times consecutively and then alternated with other plays until it reached a total of 28 performances by the end of the season. (Genest would have helped him here, as elsewhere.) He attempts to be very precise on the stage history of Rowe's *Tamerlane* and tells us that it was performed on 4 November in London until 1748, and gives a supporting footnote from Allardyce Nicoll's handlist. Unfortunately for Boas, Nicoll's *History of Early Eighteenth-Century Drama* goes no further than 1750; *Tamerlane* was still being acted on King William's birthday thirty years later. Dr. Boas is unaware of the tenacious conservatism of the eighteenth-century Briton.

But the choicest example of the author's innocence appears on p.

168, in a query about Gay's *Mohocks*. Back on pp. 144-48, he had summarized Dennis's *Appius and Virginia*. Here he ventures into criticism of the faults of the play, saying "It is such rodomontade that Pope parodies . . ." and quotes,

But Appius reddens at each word you speak,  
And stares tremendous. . . ."

On the next page he tells us that in 1711 Dennis "crossed swords with Pope." On pp. 167-68, he comes to Gay's *Mohocks* of 1712 and quotes from Gay's dedication to Dennis:

There are several reasons which induce me to lay this work at your feet. The subject of it is *Horrid* and *Tremendous*. . . . The world will easily perceive that the plot of it is formed upon that of *Appius and Virginia*. . . .

Now Boas queries, "What Gay means by saying, even in jest, that the plot is formed upon that of *Appius and Virginia* is difficult to see. . . ." It means that Boas doesn't know what was going on in 1711-1712, doesn't know that Pope's gang are baiting Dennis (even though we thought he did by his earlier reference to "crossing swords" with Dennis), and hasn't learned about it from Sherburn, Ault, E. N. Hooker, Tillotson, Butt, *et al.*

It is difficult to imagine who could be aided by this book.

A. H. SCOUTEN

*The University of Pennsylvania*

*Mary Shelley, Author of "Frankenstein."* By ELIZABETH NITCHIE.  
New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1953.  
Pp. 255. \$4.00.

It is curious to consider that Mary Shelley has reached, even though by strange and indirect ways, a larger audience than her husband. "Frankenstein" has become a household word, though most of those who know it are not aware of the name of the author and think that Frankenstein is the monster and not the scientist. A recent soft cover 25 cent reprint gives the name of the author but with no indication that she was the wife of Percy Bysshe Shelley or that the book was written nearly 150 years ago. It was presented as a modern book by a Mary Shelley, who one could presume was a promising young author (perhaps, to judge from the cover, associated with Boris Karloff).

During the Victorian period, as Elizabeth Nitchie shows, Mary Shelley was known as one of the more important women writers. She was the author of five novels in addition to *Frankenstein*, two books of travels, two short plays and some eighteen short stories, a number of articles and reviews (some of them in the *Westminster*

*Review*) and the editor of her husband's poems and prose. If we add to these the recently published Letters and the Journals she is seen to be an author of considerable productivity. And it seems strange that this book of Elizabeth Nitchie's is the first full length study devoted primarily to an examination of her literary merits.

What can we say of these merits? Outside of *Frankenstein* the only novel that has unusual power, even, at times, genius, is *The Last Man*, a vivid fantasy of the destruction of the human race, and its republication would be a worthy and probably profitable enterprise. It is in the realm of the fantastic that Mary Shelley excells. But it is, as Miss Nitchie acutely points out, the fantastic in conjunction with tragic isolation and loneliness: the last man among the ruins of earth, the solitary monster of Frankenstein's creation. No other novelist can depict such isolation with the power of Mary Shelley.

For the rest, her novels—written for money for the upbringing of her son—are of interest mainly for her portraits in them of Shelley, Byron, Trelawny, Godwin and others, all of which Miss Nitchie tracks down with considerable skill. (Some of them had been tracked down before—by Dowden, Peck and Sylva Norman—but never in such detail or with such discrimination.) The novels are a storehouse of indirect biographical information.

In addition to her gift for fantastic narrative Mary Shelley was a skilful critic and letter writer. Her Notes to Shelley's poems are extremely penetrative both critically and biographically, and Miss Nitchie does not sufficiently emphasize their importance or Mary's gifts as a critic. In fact Miss Nitchie's tendency is the unusual one of underplaying rather than overplaying her subject. No one would claim Mary Shelley as one of the great English writers but there are certainly elements of greatness in her—she was not unworthy of either of her parents—and one wonders, in reading her best productions, what she might have risen to had she been more favorably circumstanced. There is genius in *Frankenstein*, which its popularity must not be allowed to obscure, and the best things in the later works show that the flame did not die.

Miss Nitchie has produced an important study. She handles a large mass of material—much of it from her own researches—with considerable skill. Her psychological analysis is acute. She writes with a quiet grace all too unusual in scholarly works. Her book contains more information on the essential Mary Shelley, the writer and the personality, than any previous study. She takes to a new point the deeper concepts of Mary begun by Newman I. White and continued by Frederick L. Jones, and more recently, by Muriel Spark, in contrast to the older, more superficial, views of the biographies.

KENNETH NEILL CAMERON

*The Carl H. Pforzheimer Library*

---

*Matthew Arnold's "England and the Italian Question."* Edited by MERLE M. BEVINGTON. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1953. Pp. xxviii + 74. \$2.75.

Arnold was on the continent in 1859 as Foreign Assistant Commissioner of the Duke of Newcastle's Commission, making "a study of the elementary educational systems in France and the French-speaking countries" (p. xiii). He was thus in France all during the abortive war of France and Sardinia with Austria which ended in July, 1859, with the Peace of Villafranca. Arnold's pamphlet, his first independently published prose work, was an attempt to modify the attitude of the English, which was "savagely and blindly anti-Louis-Napoleonist" (letter to Clough, quoted p. xxi). It is interesting in its indications that Arnold was at this time seeking political preferment. He sent the pamphlet to various important statesmen, and the essay was clearly written as much with the intention of calling attention to its author as to enlighten the English about Napoleon III. It also contains an early statement of some of Arnold's characteristic ideas: the supremacy of the French, both governors and governed, over the English in matters of intellect, in susceptibility to ideas, and the notions that the nineteenth century was an age of rapid social and cultural change, that in such an age ideas and not force must rule, and that the English aristocracy must change or be outmoded and destroyed. The pamphlet is a mildly impassioned plea to the English upper class, asking them to reflect more perfectly than they do the "spirit of the age." This spirit Arnold defines as the ideas of "the abolition of privilege, the right of the people to choose its own government, the claims of nationalities" (p. 31), in short, the "ideas of 1789."

James Fitzjames Stephen's lively conservative attack on Arnold's pamphlet, "Matthew Arnold and the Italian Question," is appended, and there is an excellent introductory essay by the editor. Arnold's pamphlet has never before been reprinted.

HILLIS MILLER

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*The Fields Were Green: A New View of Bryant, Whittier, Holmes, Lowell, and Longfellow, with a Selection of Their Poems.* By GEORGE ARMS. Stanford University Press, 1953. Pp. 246. \$4.50.

What constitutes a cliché, in or out of literary art? Is it possible that our discourteous tendency to use a back-of-the-hand gesture, in dismissing the poetic clichés of certain once-idolized New Eng-

land poets, is in itself a cliché? Is it not true that we should reconsider and challenge our own methods and motives of criticism, in this regard, so that we may discover a firm basis for restoring the best poetry of Bryant, Whittier, Holmes, Lowell, Longfellow, to a position of honor? In *The Fields Were Green*, Professor George Arms (Chairman of the Department of English at the University of New Mexico) suggests a "new view" of these authors, and a new basis for evaluation. He begins by complaining that "our nineteenth century poets are being almost completely ignored by present-day criticism" and he repeatedly asserts his conviction that we have failed to do justice to these poets as artists. Although he carefully qualifies his own attitude, and does not claim that any one of them is a major poet, Mr. Arms insists that a "just consideration" should help us to appreciate "real literary worth" in their best works.

While clearing the way for his "new approach," Mr. Arms lists several causes for our present indifference or scorn, and in describing these causes he hints at corrective procedures of his own, later demonstrated. We are so familiar with the poetry of these once distinguished bards, he claims, that we are inclined to read them carelessly and imperceptively: "If we can bring ourselves to read this poetry with the freshness and flexibility with which we read less familiar poems, we shall find much that we otherwise miss. In spite of the differences of fashion that will often detract from these poets, we shall find that they wrote poems of much firmer texture than we realized, poems of considerable and controlled effect."

As editor of *The Explicator* (a magazine which stresses close analysis of individual poems), Mr. Arms has long shown his sympathy for technical considerations in literary criticism, and his separate essays here on each of the five poets considered, place consistent emphasis on a "new view" in terms of texture, tone, structure, imagery. "I believe," he writes, "that we ought to apply contemporary standards to literature of the past." Unfortunately, this well-intentioned procedure descends repeatedly to acts of supererogation; at times, indeed, such procedure amounts to an accidental burlesque of certain weaknesses inherent in our currently treasured principles of close technical analysis. For example, we are told that we can not appreciate the full beauty of "Barbara Frietchie" until we notice the "remarkable use of prepositions" (such as "Up from the meadows," "round about them," "Over the mountains") used by Whittier to prepare for the story. "With another step toward the main action, we come back to the first preposition and get it three times more." We are also told that in the closing couplet of this poem "the vertical movement of the 'up' prepositions is also recalled." Just how this IBM procedure heightens our awareness of beauty, we are not told.

I fear that this close analytical procedure, and the so-called "new

view" resulting from it, may leave us exactly where we started: willing to be shown that our present lack of enthusiasm for these authors is actually caused by our own blindness. Until we are shown, we are not likely to be touched deeply by the deliberately ironic appeal of Holmes for sympathy:

Yet in our veins the blood ran warm and red,  
For us the fields were green, the skies were blue,  
Though from our dust the spirit long has fled,  
We lived, we loved, we toiled, we dreamed like you,  
Smiled at our sires and thought how much we knew.

That title-providing stanza (from "American Academy Centennial Celebration") brings into focus a demand we always have a right to make on poets of the past. Even though we may give assent, repeatedly, to the reminder that the business of both life and art is to discover anew the truths of the commonplace (living, loving, toiling, dreaming), we demand of the poet who can hold us, and who can call us back, that he must make us feel certain kinds of awareness which are (if I may resort to a still lively cliché) as uncommon in literature as common in experience. In their own time, these five poets seldom could meet that ancient demand; their poetry was admired for reasons which need not (and do not) concern us. But it is safe to say that no amount of technical apparatus or praise of their competence as craftsmen can resuscitate them and make their poetry breathe—for us.

LAWRANCE THOMPSON

*Princeton University*

---

*Hemingway, the Writer as Artist.* By CARLOS BAKER. Princeton: The Princeton University Press, 1952. Pp. 322. \$4.50.

Ernest Hemingway's achievement has been recognized for more than twenty years; yet there has been little good criticism of his works. Many critics, bemused by his supposed narcissism, have variously scolded or admired the man: "the familiarly damned, familiarly self-absorbed lost generation Byron playing a part . . ." ranging from Jake Barnes to Colonel Cantwell. Some have compounded the confusion by circulating every rumor, boast, joke, or bit of malicious gossip that served to define their attitude toward Hemingway. Even before his vogue began, Dorothy Parker was able to say that "Probably of no other living man has so much tripe been penned or spoken." Thus the opportunities for the writer of the first book-length study of Hemingway were immense. He could bring our attention, too long preoccupied with the tripe, back to the works themselves and in so doing get rid of all the accumu-



lated nonsense while setting forth relevant details of Hemingway's life in a meaningful pattern.

Much of this Professor Baker has done. He warns the reader at the outset that "Because this is a book about Hemingway as an artist, it contains next to nothing about his old exploits. . . . This is not a history of his private battles or his public wars." Excluding all but what will enable us to understand and evaluate an achievement that has always been artistic before it has been anything else, Professor Baker brings order to the saga (there is no other word) of the artist and disposes of many a silly legend, many a misinterpretation. For example, he makes clear how little influence Sherwood Anderson, Gertrude Stein, and Ezra Pound had on Hemingway's development. Simply by studying the characters of the fiction in terms of their dramatic functions, he shows how badly Max Eastman, Wyndham Lewis, and D. S. Savage, to name but a few, have misread the works by identifying their protagonists with Hemingway, who had exercised the artist's right to reshape the life-stuff he works with. Professor Baker's readings have convinced him that one of Hemingway's artistic triumphs is his "remarkable union of the naturalistic and the symbolic." They have helped him to distinguish major themes among the symbols: Home and Not-Home ("Nada"), Fathers and Sons, Men Without Women. Hemingway's treatment of these themes exemplifies, Professor Baker believes, an intense moral concern—as in *The Sun Also Rises*, which he interprets as to a large extent a "dialectical struggle" between paganism and Christianity.

But Professor Baker has not succeeded in defining and accounting for the aesthetic interest of the works. He says many times that the works have great beauty, which he tends to identify as the intrinsic natural beauty of scenic panoramas. But he accounts for it largely in terms of the intensity of its effect upon his own sensibility, measured in the metaphors it suggests. Frequently he quotes a passage supposed to exhibit beauty and then by way of examination simply repeats the details, with a few more that have occurred to him, in his own words—a procedure that puts his prose in competition with Hemingway's and adds little to our understanding or our enjoyment. Virtually nothing is said of Hemingway's superb handling of point of view in his best work, of his manipulation of prose rhythms in key spots such as the beginning of "The Killers" or the climactic-symbolic scene in which Romero, the young matador of *The Sun Also Rises*, purges himself of contact with Robert Cohn. Very little is said of the way in which Hemingway wrenches his medium about, forcing it to communicate an emotional and normative content through episodes presented absolutely without comment; yet Professor Baker's comment on the union of the naturalistic and symbolic shows that he perceives the full meaning of these episodes.

The few attempts to deal with the aesthetic interest by way of

analysis suggest that Professor Baker may be impressed by the somewhat startling results obtained by fashionable critics concentrating on "structure" and "texture" but may not know just how to go about dealing with these aspects. We are told that, in a description of the removal from the ring of a slain bull, "The massing, in that section of the sentence, of a half-dozen *s*'s compounded with the *th* sounds of *swath* and *smoothly*, can hardly have been inadvertent. They ease (or grease) the path of the bulls departure." Other attempts are not so beguiling; they are only opaque:

Although they are clearly fundamental to any consideration of Hemingway's esthetic aims, place, fact, and scene are together no more than one phase of a more complex observational interest. The skillful writer can make them work in harmony, with place and fact like teamed horses under the dominance of the sense of scene. The result is often as striking and satisfactory to watch as a good chariot race. But the event is, after all, mainly an extrinsic matter. These are not Plato's horses of the soul.

Aficionados of chariot racing may be able to do something with this passage, but few of us enjoy their advantages.

What we have here, and in many other passages in the study, is a seemingly casual attitude toward language and its properties, an attitude that would place real limitations upon a critic of Hemingway as an artist. On every hand may be found awesome phrases, most of them metaphorical, that seem to say a great deal but turn out to say nothing or to say something quite misleading. Reference is made to the "emotionated substructure" of the best works, but it is extremely difficult to determine what, if anything, the term means. Elsewhere it is said that "The structural form of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* has been conceived with care and executed with the utmost brilliance. The form is that of a series of concentric circles with the all-important bridge at the middle." Readers familiar with the novel will probably find this comment baffling until they read on to discover that Professor Baker is discussing symbolism and that his metaphor of the concentric circles, striking though it may be, confuses the place of the bridge in the narrative structure, the place of the bridge in the setting, and the place of the bridge in a system of symbols. Such looseness with the language tends to reduce criticism to a mush in which anything means everything—and nothing.

But, if this study does not fully live up to the promise of its title, it will certainly help other critics to account for the "writer as artist" by penetrating many of the barriers to understanding which have long stood in the way. Incomplete as any study of an artist as artist must be, it is a useful book of interest for all students of Hemingway's work.

JOHN L. STEWART

Dartmouth College

*Critics and Criticism.* By R. S. CRANE, W. R. KEAST, RICHARD MCKEON, NORMAN MACLEAN, ELDER OLSON, BERNARD WEINBERG. Edited with an Introduction by R. S. CRANE. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1952. Pp. v + 647. \$6.00.

Roughly one-half of the largest *Ars Poetica* since Scaliger (a rod which the literary world is rather firmly commanded to kiss) is in effect a history of criticism—a somewhat uneven history marked by great learning, by a detailed study of some areas and an ignoring of others, by a consequent spottiness of the record and functional unclearness of the parts, and by some special pleading. McKeon's four essays ("The Concept of Imitation in Antiquity," "Aristotle's Conception of Language," "Rhetoric in the Middle Ages," and "Poetry and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century") are very full and enormously informative, but despite brief concluding sections indicating the short-comings of modern thought in such matters as imitation, language, etc., have not an altogether clear role in the volume. Olson's lengthy exegesis of Longinus combines a great deal that would have to be said by any discerning reader of Longinus with some truly enlightening perceptions; the reconstruction of what Longinus "must" have said in the lacunae, proceeding as it does by permitting the lacunae to have exhibited only logical extensions of hints in the surviving text, seems a severe brake upon Longinus's imagination. The essays on Renaissance and post-Renaissance figures are casually interrelated by the theme of the perversions of Aristotelianism, especially as these occurred under the influence of the rhetorical tradition; this record has a make-shift air due both to the almost complete omission of French criticism and of English criticism before 1660 and to the inconsistency of pace in essays reprinted from such incommensurate sources as a scholarly journal and a reference book. The not unfamiliar decline of Aristotelianism, studied at length in Weinberg's essays on Robertello and Castelvetro, and hurriedly sketched in Crane's "English Neo-classical Criticism," reaches a climax in Johnson, whom one therefore expects Keast to draw and quarter. But a prior decision has been made to save Johnson, so that for him there is found a forgiveness-by-historical-context not accorded to later deviationists who might hope for the same rational treatment. The history ends with Maclean's "From Action to Image: Theories of the Lyric in the Eighteenth Century," which, interesting for its relative liveliness of manner (freedom from excessive parenthesis, qualification, and abstraction) and the relative novelty of its contents, summarizes those changes in the concept of lyric which led to the growing importance of the lyric among the genres, of "romantic" ideas about the lyric, and of the idea of language, especially metaphorical language, as the "poetic essence." These

developments create the modern situation, which Maclean deploras a little more moderately, but no less regularly, than some of the others.

In part these disjunct contributions are held together by references, direct or implied, to the critical standards which the contributors affirm and which they propound more fully in a series of attacks on contemporary critics (the first quarter of the book) and in a series of essays containing formal elaborations and applications (the last quarter of the book). The latter group opens with McKeon's exhaustive demonstration of the way in which different philosophic concepts are operative in all kinds of decisions and choices made by artists, critics, and aestheticians. Then Olson does the formal continuation and extension of Aristotle upon which the school depends, and adds a dialogue on symbolism intended to undermine that critical mode which investigates the symbolic structures of literary works. Since the Chicago concern is largely with the determination of critical procedures, it is not surprising that less than a tenth of the book should be given to the analysis of literary objects. Maclean on Lear's madness, exemplifying the movement from rule to work, is neither very novel nor very agile, and he approaches the parodistic when he devotes some 1500 words to accounting for Lear's line, "Hast thou given all to thy daughters, and art come to this?" On *Tom Jones*, Crane is alternately unimpressive and impressive: the former when, in endeavoring to isolate the "distinctive whole" of the novel, he is driven to such an inclusive list of items that it hardly progresses beyond an undefining medley; the latter when in explicating the "working or power" of the novel—which is not precisely a new mode of critical operation today—he demonstrates how Fielding orders the narrative materials to control the comic tone.

This resurrection of the Quarrel of the Ancients with the Moderns (in this book, *modern* is virtually a four-letter word) endeavors to rehabilitate a deductive criticism, and it may be seen historically as a reaction against the "free" or "open" critical modes whose initial point is a receptive submission to the work (which is also not entirely un-Aristotelian). Any such pendular swing will have some corrective utility, though not all the points in the new position are entirely different from the positions of those whom the Chicagoans wish to supplant. Their *holistic* or *organicist* emphasis is new in neither theory nor practice. Two other positions of theirs, *precedentism* and *hierarchalism* (appearing chiefly in their wish to depress the lyric), will seem, one may guess, among the less compelling parts of their code. These are less central than their *genericism*—their insistence on placing the work with respect to its kind, and on the analysis of it with respect to its generic traits (i. e., as tragedy, etc.)—which may have a sense that few will wish to deny, but which, in the hands of system-

makers, leads to an ignoring of elements common to different genres, of the cross-fertilization of genres (drama and lyric poetry in the Renaissance, fiction and poetry today), of the generic evolution known to Aristotle, and, most of all, of the vital differences between literary objects which are generically identical or allied. The *generalist* criticism which they oppose has served to keep just such matters in mind. Essential to their *genericism* is *affectivism*—the dogma that the genre is identified by the production of certain pleasures, and that criticism must be concerned with the mode of the elicitation of the proper emotional responses. No one will question the profitableness of discovering the poetical sources of pity, fear, etc. (assuming that purgation is no more complex an issue than these writers appear to make it), but to make this concern exclusive is attended by certain disadvantage—one of which is that the method does not differentiate an initial experience of a work from a third or a tenth experience, and another, still more conspicuous, that the method fails entirely to distinguish qualitatively among a wide spread of works which produce generically proper pleasures ranging from the lofty to the gross. Olson cannot meet this difficulty by his statement that he speaks of “high art,” for he provides no way of discriminating it; indeed, with his stress on the technical accessories of unexpectedness and suspense, which have an absolute status unqualified by the degree of their organic necessity or their maturity, he seems at times to be sketching an aesthetics of popular or “entertainment” art. The difficulty is not lessened by other aspects of the code—*mimeticism*, *intentionalism*, and various negations, *anti-symbolicism*, *anti-mythicism* (there is, incidentally, no recognition of the contributions of Freud and Jung to literary analysis), *anti-semanticism*—all meant to preserve immediate emotional responses as the sole criterion and to eliminate as irrelevant or non-existent the element of “meaning” with which certain contemporary approaches have been productively concerned. The anti-modernistic animus (whatever is, is wrong) risks committing literature to triviality in this false separation of meaning and feeling—as if a severely limited and ordered representation of a human action, shaped by both conscious and unconscious forces making innumerable choices (as to agents, actions, scenes, etc.) involving the artist’s beliefs, judgments, and conceptions as well as his technical stratagems and conveyed in words that are determinative forces, could evoke sensation and emotion but not perception, awareness, understanding, and reflection: results which doubtless vary in temporal priority, in accordance with density of surface or substance, but of which the complex interdependence and interaction need to be explicated, not denied for the sake of logical purity. Their final negation, for which there is no convenient name, is of the significant or constructive role of words: diction is said to be subordinate to all other elements in a



composition and to be legitimately examinable only in respect to its status as determined by character, situation, etc. Whatever may be said for this view of cause and effect in a purely logical order, in the order of living literary experience it presupposes an aesthetic communication in a linguistic vacuum, a quasi-telepathetic transfer of an artistic whole from which we its recipients and possessors may then deduce the rectitude of its parts. But the fact of life is that we receive and possess the whole through its parts, of which the devices of poetic language are not the least, so that the situation for criticism is that of an extremely complex reciprocity of part and whole. The Chicago cult of *imago delenda est*, which for its own purposes exaggerates the modern concern with the dictional part and ignores the equal concern with the wholes which are the sum of the parts, will simplify the problem—by begging the question of the nature of the whole and of our knowledge of it. We can but admire the relentless and indefatigable ratiocination of these critics, but we are left, finally, with the disturbing suspicion that the infinite variety, ambiguity, and resistance to logical reformulation which characterize literary wholes and literary parts have been aridly dismissed, and that now all that is left to do is to apply the categories and the affective metronomes, in the spirit of Olson's promise that "theory can make available to the poet a calculus of the frame of mind of the audience, of the nature of emotions, etc., to determine the order of representation which will produce the maximum emotional effect." This blueprint view of the creation, working, and judging of art will effect, among other results, the elimination of most criticism of the last half-century, and it is clear that these critics, despite one or two ceremonial bows toward pluralism (which apparently McKeon alone takes seriously), would have it so. Samson Chicagonistes is pulling down all the temples.

In style the other contributors gravitate, though imperfectly, toward the habits of McKeon, who does not aspire to a varied, spirited, and diaphanous prose, and who inclines to wrap up the brain child in so many folds of verbal swaddling that it is well-nigh smothered. The range of styles is pretty well illustrated in Crane, who can be lucid and epigrammatic, but in whom the naked killer-instinct of one moment is the next moment taking sanctuary in the quasi-urbane and the quasi-legal, both a trifle ponderous, and whose inclination to a kind of obese Johnsonese leads him, when he wants to say, "But standards could be formulated in terms of the audience by distinguishing the general public from select minds who judge merit reliably," to say instead, "But the formulation of standards could also be made more directly in terms of the audience by means of devices designed to effect a qualitative separation between readers and spectators in general and those select minds whose judgment could be considered as in some degree equivalent to the reasoned verdict of true criticism itself, or at least as a confirmatory sign of



the presence of merit." This addiction to labored intricacy of syntax, which is more burdensome than the arguments themselves, is one facet of a professorial habit of mind which we also recognize through a quite different symptom—a dogmatic, petulant, and overbearing manner. Add to this a Puritan tendency to decree a single strait and narrow path to literary virtue, and a strong propensity to political action which leads its possessors to a throw-the-rascals-out style of disputation, and the result is an atmosphere not altogether favorable to a rhetoric of persuasive grace. There is indeed a dismaying incivility of manner (exempted: McKeon and Weinberg entirely, and Maclean partly), and one must wonder at the apparently obsessive need continually to express contempt for other critics, of whom at least some have brought no small genius to bear on literary problems. It is a pity that a project from which much can be learned should come, through the intrusion of self-assurance, censoriousness, and spleen, to savor so strongly of the work of Rymer and Collier.

ROBERT B. HEILMAN

University of Washington

---

*Ulrich von Zatzikhoven: Lanzelet: A Romance of Lancelot.* Translated from the Middle High German by KENNETH G. T. WEBSTER. Revised and Provided with additional notes and an Introduction by ROGER SHERMAN LOOMIS. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951 (*Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies*, XLVII). Pp. viii + 238. \$3.50.

This translation by the late Professor Kenneth Webster, which has been revised, further annotated, and edited after his death by his friend and colleague, Professor Roger Loomis, is an important contribution to the field of Arthurian scholarship, in fact to the field of comparative literature in general. It is of particular value in that the only other edition of Ulrich's poem is now difficult to obtain, having been published in a limited printing more than a century ago (by K. Hahn, Frankfurt, 1845). Moreover, the present translation will bring Ulrich's poem for the first time to those who do not read Middle High German.

Ulrich's *Lanzelet*, having but little intrinsic literary merit, is valued largely for the light it throws upon its source, a now lost Anglo-Norman original. For the student of sources, Webster's translation can well take the place of the almost inaccessible Middle High German edition. Some Germanists may regret that such a labor of love has been devoted to so unpromising a poem as *Lanzelet*,

while better medieval German works remain untranslated. Yet, despite Ulrich's somewhat clumsy style and disjointed and poorly motivated plot, the contents of his poem provide a valuable historical document, one well worthy of becoming a "Record of Civilization."

Dr. Loomis has contributed a short (pp. 3-19) but compact introduction, devoted primarily to the poem's *Entstehungsgeschichte*, its lost Anglo-Norman source, and its remote Celtic origins. In this brief introduction he not only summarizes the most significant research on these problems made by Webster and earlier authorities, but also collates it with much original scholarship. His assertions are further documented in the voluminous notes which he has added to those left by Webster; and he has further enhanced the usefulness of his own and his predecessor's notes with a detailed index of all subjects discussed in them.

Fortunately Webster did not write his translation in verse. Even if it were linguistically possible to reproduce the exact metre and rime of a thirteenth-century poem and yet retain its meaning, the result would be unpalatable to a twentieth-century reader; and this would be particularly true of Ulrich's uninspired versification. In view of the fact that neither the translator nor the editor was a specialist in Middle High German, it was inevitable that some small inaccuracies appear in the translation. However, most of these concern unessential matters of vocabulary and syntax and do not detract from an understanding of the plot.

On the other hand it is regrettable that this translation occasionally follows the prevailing custom of rendering MHG *êre* as "honor," a custom which helps distort our view of courtly values in medieval Germany. Most Americans associate the word "honor" with some idea of decency, integrity, and inner sense of what is right. The word *êre*, on the contrary, seems to have referred not to any such moral qualities but rather to outward manifestations of respect and to the resulting esteem enjoyed by their recipient (It is probable that *êre* and *aestimo* are cognate). According to Friedrich Maurer, "Sorgfältige Interpretation aller Stellen, an denen Hartmann, Walther, Wolfram, Gottfried das Wort *êre* gebrauchen, zeigt, dass bis auf verschwindende und unsicher bleibende Ausnahmen nur jene "äussere Ehre" damit bezeichnet wird."<sup>1</sup> Even these apparent exceptions are not hard to explain, since *êre* often presupposed certain moral qualities. For example, one cannot say that "highly respected" means "honest." Of course, if one tells you

<sup>1</sup> "Zum Ritterlichen 'Tugendsystem,'" *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift*, xxiv (1950), p. 530. Likewise, in the preface to his volume *Leid* (Bern and Munich, 1951), he says concerning the Hohenstaufen period, "noch ist etwa das Wort *ere* kaum versehen mit dem Inhalt der ethischen Qualität." Throughout this work he interprets the word primarily in its sense of social recognition.

that John Doe is highly respected, you feel justified in trusting him, because he would not be respected in our society unless he were trustworthy. However, since some other society may respect deception, one cannot say that "highly respected" necessarily means "honest." Likewise, we may assume that MHG heroes who enjoyed *êre* had certain virtues such as courage and loyalty, but not necessarily "honor" as we now understand the term. Therefore, in order not to mislead their readers, translators of MHG poems should avoid translating *êre* as "honor." Instead they should try to find the meaning appropriate to each given context, be it respect, compliment, praise, acclaim, adulation, deference, honors, awe, distinction, or else fame, renown, prestige, glory, eminence, social standing, or reputation.

Several passages in this translation indicate that the translator believed that *êre* denoted a personal quality; and in each case this belief caused a misinterpretation. For example, v. 5404 (*dâ wart durch êre vil verzeret*) does not mean "For this he was praised and his honor enhanced," but rather, "Much was consumed there for the sake of winning praise." Likewise, when Gilimar escorts his guests *durch sîn selbes êre* (v. 6630), he does so "for the sake of his own renown," and not "In his honorable fashion." When Ade's vassals refrain from attacking Lanzelet *durch ir êre* (v. 1578), they do so not "out of their sense of honor," but rather "to save their reputations," which they would lose by disobeying their lawful liege-lady. Likewise, v. 5264 (*diu unveiles um êre nie kein guot gewan*) does not mean "who was too honorable ever to gain any unfair advantage," but rather, "who never acquired any wealth without expending some of it to gain praise." Perhaps the highest virtue of the nobility, at least in the eyes of the professional minstrels, was the ability and willingness to exchange riches for praise and prestige (*guot um êre geben*). Ulrich makes much mention of this convention (vv. 1252, 4030, 5504, 5596, 5618, 5670, 5729, 5742, 5761, 7204, *et passim*, and especially 9435). Perhaps the best example of this convention in Ulrich's poem is in the episode (vv. 1252 ff.) in which Lanzelet, who has killed Galagandreiz and married his daughter, freely dispenses his victim's wealth in an effort to obtain *êre*. Here the English word "honor" hardly expresses the right value.

The relationship between *êre* and *milde* explains other passages misinterpreted in this translation. For example, v. 4038 (*daz ir liep waere verswigen*) does not mean, "There was no fear of her ever being charged with concealing her love," but rather, "No one dared charge that she let her goodness (generosity) remain unmentioned." This statement merely corroborates an earlier one (v. 4030): "She was ever ready to give what she could to gain praise." Webster's translation would violate the code that courtly love was kept clandestine. Moreover, *liep* usually designated

pleasure, joy, kindness, favor, as is brought out in vv. 4673 and 4681, in which *minne* causes *liebe* (translated as "love" both times by Webster). Since one was exalted by giving, one was consequently lowered by accepting gifts, except from a socially higher person. This fact explains v. 5729 (*dā enwas kein widersatz*), which does not mean "there was no strife," but rather, "There was no giving in return." Webster's translation is possible, except that the German does not express the thought "and so." Judging by medieval poetry, it would seem that gifts were motivated primarily by a will to superiority and a desire to obligate people and win praise; almost without exception the poet emphasizes the donor's great wealth, never his self-denial. In this case, King Arthur, as highest overlord, must give lavishly, without sullyng himself by receiving in return (The gift from the mermaid was a curio rather than a treasure). That Arthur was successful in his giving is seen in v. 7207.

This association of *êre* also explains v. 5761 *künec, du müezest gêret sîn, von got (und ouch diu künegin, und allen den du quotes ganst wan duz wol verschulden kanst mit quote und mit dem libe dîn)*. This does not mean "Oh king, God save you and also the queen, and all to whom you mean well; for you merit it both by your valor and your rank," but rather, "King, may you and the queen be honored by God and by all to whom you have granted riches, because you can well obligate them to it with your wealth and your person." The messenger is telling Arthur that her mistress hopes he will have the same success as the lady in v. 4038, whose generosity achieved the desired goal of acclaim. It is of interest to note that, in accordance with the medieval concept of *do ut des*, Arthur's generosity has also obligated God to enhance his reputation. Since no affection or self-denial is necessarily implied by the word *milde*, we must be careful how we interpret the word. For example, v. 7204 (*iwer herze ie bas für ander man ze milte stuont*) does not mean "your heart is always more kindly disposed toward other men," but rather "your heart has surpassed other men in generous giving." As one might expect, this show of generosity again succeeded in buying renown (v. 7207 *ir hant es êre*).

The reviewer has taken exception to this questionable, even if conventional, interpretation of *êre* only in hopes that it will be reconsidered in the next edition, which this splendid and useful work will surely have.

GEORGE FENWICK JONES

Princeton University

## BOOKS RECEIVED

## ENGLISH

- Asselineau, Roger.**—*L'Évolution de Walt Whitman*. Paris: Didier, 1954. Pp. 567.
- . *The Literary Reputation of Mark Twain from 1910 to 1950*. Paris: Didier, 1954. Pp. 240.
- Bennett, Josephine W.**—*The Rediscovery of Sir John Mandeville*. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1954. Pp. 436. \$6.70. (Monograph Series, 19.)
- Derolez, R.**—*Runica Manuscripta*. Bruges: De Tempel, 1954. Pp. lxiv + 455.
- Dickens, Charles.**—*Barnaby Rudge*. Ed. Kathleen Tillatson. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. xxv + 634. \$3.00. (New Oxford Illustrated Dickens.)
- Eichenberger, Karl.**—*Oliver Goldsmith: Das Komische in den Werken seiner Reifeperiode*. Bern: A. Francke, 1954. Pp. 126. (Swiss Studies in English, 35.)
- Ellman, Richard.**—*The Identity of Yeats*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. ix + 343. \$6.00.
- Evans, Joan.**—*John Ruskin*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. 447. \$4.25.
- Ewald, William B., Jr.**—*The Masks of Jonathan Swift*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. 203. \$4.50.
- Federle, Walter.**—*Robert Brownings Dramatisches Experiment*. Zürich: Oskar Schel- lenberg, 1954. Pp. 128.
- Fussell, Edwin S.**—*Edwin Arlington Robinson, the Literary Background of a Traditional Poet*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1954. Pp. x + 211. \$3.50.
- Gagen, Jean.**—*The New Woman: Her Emergence in English Drama (1600-1730)*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1954. Pp. 193. \$3.50.
- Haymaker, Richard E.**—*From Pampas to Hedgerows and Downs: a Study of W. H. Hudson*. New York: Bookman Associates, 1954. Pp. 398. \$5.00.
- Hunt, Clay.**—*Donne's Poetry: Essays in Literary Analysis*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. xiv + 256. \$3.75.
- Kaiser, Rolf (ed.)**—*Alt- und Mittelenglische Anthologie*. Berlin: Konrad Triltsch, 1954. Pp. xxix + 474.
- Keats, John.**—*Letters*. Selected by Frederick Page. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. xii + 460. \$2.25. (World's Classics, 541.)
- Kökeritz, Helge.**—*A Guide to Chaucer's Pronunciation*. New Haven: Whitlock's Inc., 1954. Pp. 32.
- Malory, Sir Thomas.**—*Works*. Ed. by Eugène Vinaver. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. xviii + 919. \$5.00. (Oxford Standard Authors.)
- Palmer, Ralph G.**—*Seneca's "De Remediis Fortuitorum" and the Elizabethans*. Chicago: Institute of Elizabethan Studies, 1953. Pp. 66. (Institute of Elizabethan Studies, 1.)
- Partridge, Eric.**—*The Concise Usage and Abuse: A Modern Guide to Good English*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954. Pp. x + 219. \$3.50.
- Pellegrini, Giuliano.**—*Barocco Inglese*. Firenze: G. D'Anna, 1953. Pp. 245. (Biblioteca di Cultura Contemporanea, 41.)
- Pulos, C. E.**—*The Deep Truth, a Study of Shelley's Septicism*. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1954. Pp. 124.
- Purdy, Richard Little.**—*Thomas Hardy: A Bibliographical Study*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. xiv + 388. \$9.00.
- Quirk, Randolph.**—*The Concessive Relation in Old English Poetry*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. xiv + 150. (Yale Studies in English, 124.)
- Sheard, J. A.**—*The Words We Use*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1954. Pp. 344. \$4.50.
- Simms, William G.**—*Letters*. Vol. 3. Ed. by M. C. S. Oliphant and T. C. D. Eaves. Columbia, S. C.: Univ. of South Carolina Press, 1954. Pp. xxv + 564. \$8.50.
- Spenser, Edmund.**—*Amoretti & Epithalamion*. Trans. with intro. and notes by Anna Maria Crino. Firenze: Editrice Universitaria, 1954. Pp. 195.
- Starr, Nathan C.**—*King Arthur Today, The Arthurian Legend in English and American Literature, 1901-1953*. Gainesville, Fla.: Univ. of Florida Press, 1954. Pp. xvii + 218. \$4.50 cloth; \$3.50 paper.
- Stene, Aasta.**—*Hiatus in English*. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1954. Pp. 102. (Anglistica, 3.)



**Taylor, Estella Ruth.**—The Modern Irish Writers. *Lawrence*: Univ. of Kansas Press, 1954. Pp. x + 176. \$3.50.

**Traugott, John** — Tristram Shandy's World: Sterne's Philosophical Rhetoric. *Berkeley and Los Angeles*: Univ. of California Press, 1954. Pp. xvi + 166. \$3.00.

**Wimsatt, W. K., Jr.**—The Verbal Icon, Studies in the Meaning of Poetry. University of Kentucky Press, 1954. Pp. xviii + 299. \$4.00.

**Wordsworth, William.**—Letters. Selected by Philip Wayne. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. xxiv + 295. \$1.25. (World's Classics, 531.)

### GERMAN

**Baetke, Walter.**—De Eikbom. Eine Auswahl Niederdeutscher Dichtungen. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1953. Pp. 193. DM 7.50.

**Belmore, H. W.**—Rilke's Craftsmanship. *Oxford*: Blackwell, 1954. Pp. 233.

**Fairley, Barker.**—Goethe's Faust: Six Essays. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1953. Pp. vi + 132. \$3.00.

**Götze, A., and Schmitt, L. E.**—Aus dem Sozialen und Politischen Kampf: Neudrucke Deutscher Literaturwerke des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1953. Pp. 64. DM 2.50.

**Grillparzer, Franz.**—König Ottokars Glück und Ende. Ed. Lionel H. C. Thomas. *Oxford*: Blackwell, 1953. Pp. 119. 7s 6d net.

**Jørgensen, Peter.**—Zum Schleswiger Niederdeutsch. Kritik und Forschung. Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser, bind 34, nr. 2. *Copenhagen*: Munksgaard, 1954. Pp. 151. Dan. Kr. 15.

**Körner, Josef.**—Wortkunst ohne Name: Übungstexte zur Gehalt- Motive- und Formanalyse. *Bern*: Francke, 1954. Pp. 108. S. Fr. 4.50.

**Kralik, Dietrich.**—Wer War der Dichter des Nibelungenliedes? *Wien*: Oesterreichischer Bundesverlag, 1954. Pp. 28. DM 1.10.

**Luther, Martin.**—Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen. Ed. L. E. Schmitt. *Halle*: Niemeyer Verlag, 1953. Pp. 90. DM 2.50.

**McCormick, Edward Allan.**—Die Spracheigenart von Walt Whitmans 'Leaves of

Grass' in deutscher Uebertragung. *Bern*: Haupt, 1953. Pp. 118. DM 8.60.

**Muschg, Walter.**—Jeremias Gotthelf. *Dalp-Taschenbücher*, Bd. 303. *Bern*: Francke, 1954. Pp. 219. Fr. 2.90/DM 2.50.

**Muth, Ludwig.**—Kleist und Kant: Versuch einer neuen Interpretation. *Kantstudien*, No. 68. *Köln*: Kölner Universitäts-Verlag, 1954. Pp. 83.

**Philippson, Ernst Alfred.**—Die Genealogie der Goetter in Germanischer Religion, Mythologie und Theologie. U. of Illinois Studies in Lang. and Lit., Vol. 37, No. 3. *Urbana*: U. of Illinois Press, 1953. Pp. ix + 94. Cloth \$3.50.

**Silz, Walter.**—Realism and Realty. University of North Carolina Studies in Germanic Lang. and Lit., No. 11. *Chapel Hill*: U. of North Carolina Press, 1954. Pp. 168. Cloth \$4.50. Paper \$4.00.

**Spalding, Keith.**—An Historical Dictionary of German Figurative Usage. Fascicles 1-3. *Oxford*: Basil Blackwell, 1953. Pp. 136. Per fascicle 10s 6d net.

**Stahl, E. L.**—Friedrich Schiller's Drama: Theory and Practice. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. vi + 172. 18s/\$2.90.

**Voigt, Rudolf.** Das Sehnsüchtige. *Herrn Osterode/Harz*: Giebel Verlag, 1953. Pp. 54.

**Waidson, H. M.**—Jeremias Gotthelf: An Introduction to the Swiss Novelist. *Oxford*: Blackwell, 1953. Pp. xii + 231. 25s net.

**Winkelman, John.**—Social Criticism in the Early Works of Erich Kästner. U. of Missouri Studies, Vol. 25, No. 4. *Columbia*: U. of Missouri Press, 1953. Pp. 144. \$2.50.

**Wolff, Hans M.**—Heinrich von Kleist. *Bern*: Francke, 1954. Pp. 332. S. Fr. 19.50.

### FRENCH

**Baudelaire, Charles.**—The Flowers of Evil. Trans. William Aggeler. *Fresno*: Academy Library Guild, 1954.

**Belleau, Remy.**—La Bergerie. Ed. Doris Delacourcelle. *Genève-Lilly*: Droz-Girard, 1954. Pp. 152.

**Carpenter, Nan Cooke.**—Rabelais and Music. *Chapel Hill*: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1954. Pp. 149.

**Corbiere, Tristan.**—Selections from Les Amours Jaunes. Trans. C. F. MacIntyre.



Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1954. Pp. 242. \$3.75.

Craig, Barbara M. (ed.).—L'Estoire de Griseldis. *Lawrence*: Univ. of Kansas Press, 1954. Pp. 72.

Crosland, Margaret.—Colette, a Provincial in Paris. *New York*: British Book Centre, 1954. Pp. 282.

Delbouille, Maurice.—Sur la Genèse de la Chanson de Roland. *Bruxelles*: Palais des Académies, 1954. Pp. 167.

Ekstrom, Per G.—Evasions et Désespérances de Pierre Loti. *Göteborg*: Gumperts Förlag—*Paris*: Librairie Nizet, 1953. Pp. 133.

Frank, Grace.—The Medieval French Drama. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1954. Pp. 296.

Frank, István.—Répertoire Métrique de la Poésie des Troubadours. *Paris*: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1953. Pp. 195.

Hugo, Victor.—Les Orientales. Ed. Elisabeth Barineau. *Paris*: Didier, 1954. Pp. 218.

Jones, P. Mansell.—Modern French Verse: An Anthology of Poems 1850-1920. *Manchester*: Manchester Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. 133.

Lafeuille, G.—Les Aphorismes Ypocras de Martin de Saint-Gille. *Cambridge*: Harvard Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. 165. \$5.50.

Maurer, Karl.—Interpretationen zur späteren Lyrik Paul Valéry's. *München*: Leo Lehnen, 1954. Pp. 252.

Renan, Ernest.—Caliban, suite de la Tempête. Ed. Colin Smith. *Manchester*: Manchester Univ. Press, 1954.

Renucci, Paul.—Dante: Disciple et Juge du Monde Gréco-latin. *Paris*: Les Belles-Lettres, 1954. Pp. 485.

Scherer, Jacques.—La Dramaturgie de Beaumarchais. *Paris*: Nizet, 1954. Pp. 258.

Smith, Edwin B.—Jean-Sylvain Bailly: Astronomer, Mystic, Revolutionary. *Philadelphia*: American Philosophical Soc., 1954. Pp. 427-538. \$2.00. (Transactions of the A. P. S., n. s. 44, pt. 4.)

Suckling, Norman.—Paul Valéry and the Civilized Mind. *Oxford*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. 285.

Verniere, Paul.—Spinoza et la Pensée Française avant la Révolution. *Paris*:

Presse Universitaires de France, 1954, Vol. I and Vol. II. Pp. 770.

Vivier, Robert.—Et la Poésie fut langage. *Bruxelles*: Palais des Académies, 1954. Pp. 232.

Zeller, Sister Mary Francine, O. S. F.—New Aspects of Style in the Maxims of La Rochefoucauld. *Washington, D. C.*: Catholic Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. x + 174.

## ITALIAN

Alighieri, Dante.—Die göttliche Komödie, übersetzt von Hermann Gmelin. Kommentar. Erster Teil: Die Hölle. *Stuttgart*: Ernst Klett, 1954. Pp. 495.

—. The Inferno. Trans. John Ciardi. *New Brunswick*: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. 288. \$4.50.

Ariosto, Ludovico.—Orlando Furioso. Trans. Allan Gilbert. *New York*: Vanni, 1954. Pp. xl + 877.

Ayrosa, Plínio.—Apontamentos para a bibliografia da língua tupi-guarani. *São Paulo*: Universidade de São Paulo, 1954. Pp. 261.

Wilkins, Ernest Hatch.—A History of Italian Literature. *Cambridge*: Harvard Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. ix + 523. \$7.50.

## SPANISH

Castro, Américo.—Iberoamérica: su historia y su cultura (3rd rev. ed.). *New York*: Dryden, 1954. Pp. xi + 322. \$3.00.

Del Río, Angel.—Antología general de la literatura española: verso, prosa, teatro. *New York*: Dryden, 1954. Vol. I, p. xvi + 908; vol. II, pp. xv + 869. \$12.00.

Kahane, Henry R., et al.—Descriptive Studies in Spanish Grammar. *Urbana*: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1954. Pp. xiii + 251.

Le Gentil, Pierre.—Le Virelai et le villancico. Le problème des origines arabes. *Paris*: Les Belles Lettres, 1954. Pp. 279.

Marin, Diego.—Lira Española. *Toronto*: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1954. Pp. 375.

Pattison, Walter T.—Benito Pérez Galdós and the Creative Process. *Minneapolis*: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1954. Pp. 146.

Vega, Lope de.—Jerusalén Conquistada. *Madrid*: C. S. I. C., 1954, Vol. I, pp. 515; Vol. II, pp. 507; Vol. III, pp. 417.

Watkins, Alma Taylor.—Eroticism in the Novels of Felipe Trigo. *New York*: Bookman Associates, 1954. Pp. 162. \$3.50.

## SLAVIC

Skendi, Stavro.—Albanian and South Slavic Oral Epic Poetry. *Philadelphia*: American Folklore Society, 1954. Pp. viii + 221. (Memoirs of the American Folklore Society, 44.)

## GENERAL

Elton, William (ed.).—Aesthetics and Language. *New York*: Philosophical Library, 1954. Pp. vi + 186. \$4.75.

Falk, Eugene H.—Renunciation as a

Tragic Focus: A Study of Five Plays. *Minneapolis*: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1954. Pp. xviii + 97. \$3.00.

Pei, Mario A., and Gaynor, Frank.—A Dictionary of Linguistics. *New York*: Philosophical Library, 1954. Pp. viii + 238. \$6.00.

Pulgram, Ernst (ed.).—Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching. *Washington, D. C.*: Georgetown Univ. Press, 1954. Pp. viii + 85. \$1.00. (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, 6.)

Singer, Armand E.—A Bibliography of the Don Juan Theme, Versions and Criticism. *Morgantown, W. Va.*: West Virginia Univ., 1954. Pp. 174. (West Virginia Univ. Bulletin, 54, no. 10-1.)

1954

Plays.  
Press,

t. — A  
York:  
+ 238.

inguin-  
ington,  
i. Pp.  
ies on

of the  
ticism.  
Univ.  
v. Bul-

54

79  
em,

- A  
ork:  
238.

guis-  
pton,  
Pp  
s on

of the  
cism.  
Univ.  
Bol-

# GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS AND ASSISTANTSHIPS IN ENGLISH

AT

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY



The following fellowships, scholarships, and junior instructorships are available to specially qualified students who are accepted as candidates for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English at The Johns Hopkins University. Those marked \* are specifically for students in the Department of English; the others are available in open university competition. There are no teaching or other requirements except for the junior instructorships.

**GUSTAV BISSING FELLOWSHIPS.** Up to \$3,000.  
(for post-doctoral research or advanced Ph.D. candidates).

\* **PRESIDENT'S SCHOLARSHIPS.** Up to \$1,750.

\* **SPECIAL SCHOLARSHIPS.** \$1,350.

**UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIPS.** \$800.  
(full tuition). (may be combined with the following)

\* **JUNIOR INSTRUCTORSHIPS.** \$750.  
(teaching one section of writing or literature).

Applications must be completed by March 1, including at least three letters of recommendation, and awards will be made about April 1. Requests for application blanks should be addressed to the Director of Admissions. Further information may be obtained from the

DIRECTOR OF ADMISSIONS,

SHRIVER HALL,

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, BALTIMORE 18, MD.



For intermediate reading

ANDRÉ GIDE'S

## La Symphonie pastorale

This new classroom edition of a great modern classic has been competently prepared by a British scholar, M. SHACKLETON, and the recognized Gide authority in this country—JUSTIN O'BRIEN of Columbia University. The sympathetically told story of the Pastor and his protégée, blind Gertrude, will appeal to students and teachers both for its unique theme and for its deep soundings of human motives and emotions. *Vocabulary and notes. Ready this month.*

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Sales Offices: New York 14 Chicago 16 San Francisco 5 Atlanta 3  
Dallas 1 Home Office: Boston 16

## Announcing the new line of McKAY'S MODERN Foreign-Language DICTIONARIES

These new, completely up-to-date dictionaries are the result of continued and careful research into the linguistic needs of today's student, business man, traveler and general reader. They are practical, geared to the requirements of today; obsolete and uncommon terms have been scrapped. They combine authority with legibility of type and handiness of format, and they are bound to stand years of use. In every way they are the best value in the foreign-language dictionary field.

NOW READY: German \$3.00; Italian, \$3.50; Swedish, \$3.50; Dutch, \$4.00; Portuguese, \$3.00; Spanish, \$5.50; Norwegian, \$6.00; Danish, \$6.00.

*Examination copies sent on approval to  
accredited teachers of languages. Write to*

DAVID McKAY COMPANY, INC. 55 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 3